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ABSTRACT

An edition of the *Conduct of Life* based on the six extant manuscripts with full commentary, complementary critical and codicological analysis, notes and introduction.

The *Conduct of Life*, also known as the *Poema Morale*, is a verse-sermon that has been largely ignored by literary histories, and despite the longevity of its textual tradition its various texts have never been the subject of extended study. This dissertation brings together the seven manuscript versions of the text, which date from the end of the twelfth to the end of the thirteenth centuries, and re-examines them individually and as a cohort exhibiting variance. It therefore offers a revealing indicator of how continuity and change actually operated through the interaction between preceding tradition and scribes and audiences.

This is achieved through a three-fold analysis of the verse sermon which highlights the fluidity of the manuscript culture during this period and the willingness of scribes to adapt texts to suit new purposes, to create differences due to dialect and comprehension, or copy variants from a now lost exemplar. First, an edition of the text, based on the version found in Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52, folios 2r-9v, explores, through the accompanying notes, the themes, style and phraseology which not only reflect the influence of earlier English literary and hortatory texts but also represent a living tradition which found popularity within diverse writing and social environments. Secondly, a diplomatic edition of each text is presented, preceded by an introduction to the text, grammar and dialect, with full codicological and
palaeographic notes. Finally, a parallel text edition bears witness to the copying and reshaping of the text throughout its history. It is accompanied by extensive linguistic notes which highlight the adaptation and textual variance between each version of the *Conduct of Life*.

Each new variant has not only been read in relation to the other versions of the same *work* but also in relation to the manuscript context it newly occupies as a result of its transmission. Each copy reshapes the material within an established structure of rhythm and metre and, therefore, the dissertation concludes that the sermon is recreated as a series of individual texts, which might be individually analysed, because each is different, particularly within their specific physical and historical moments. This fluidity or *mouvance* suggests for the *Conduct of Life* and, for that matter, the texts that preceded it in the historical narrative of the twelfth century that there is no authentic text; that the instability of the manuscript ‘tradition’ moves from manuscript to manuscript.
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All quotations from the Bible are to: *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. R. Weber and R. Gryson (Stuttgart, 2007) (the Vulgate)

2. MANUSCRIPT SIGLA

Trinity: Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52
Lambeth: London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487
Digby: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4
Egerton: British Library MS Egerton 613
Jesus: Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II
McClean: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123

Within the section concerning the language of the Conduct of Life the sigla for the individual texts is as follows:

T: Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52, folios 2r-9v
L: London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487, folios 59v-65r
D: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4, folios 97r-110v
E1: British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 7r-12v
E2: British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 64r-70v
J: Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II, folios 169v-174v
M: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123, folios 115r-120v

3. DESCRIPTIVE CONVENTIONS

Codicological:

Rectos and versos are indicated by superscript, e.g. folios 7r-12v. Superscript ‘a’ and ‘b’ are used to indicate the columns on a page, e.g. folio 7ra.
Dating Conventions:

The dating of manuscripts is indicated using roman numerals: ‘s. xii’ indicates a 12th-century manuscript, ‘s. xiii’ indicates a 13th-century manuscript, etc.

Superscript ‘1’ is used for first half of a century: s. xii\(^1\) for 1100-1150AD.

Superscript ‘2’ is used for second half of a century: s. xii\(^2\) for 1150-1200AD.

Superscript 'in' is used for first quarter of a century: s. xii\(^{in}\) for 1100-1125AD.

Superscript 'ex' is used for final quarter of a century: s. xii\(^{ex}\) for 1175-1200AD.

Superscript 'med' is used for two middle quarters of a century: s. xii\(^{med}\) for 1125-1175AD.

The turn of a century may be indicated by s. xii\(^{ex}\)-s. xiii\(^{in}\) (for 1175-1225AD) or by c. 1200.
A History of Modern Versions

In 1705 George Hicks was the first to publish printed extracts from the *Conduct of Life* taken from Digby and supplied to him by Edward Thwaites.¹ In Hicks’ *Thesaurus* he also acknowledges the existence of the version of the verse sermon found in Lambeth and adds variants, in the footnotes, from Trinity. In 1774 Thomas Warton noted the existence of the version found in Jesus.² In 1843 both of the texts found in Egerton were added to the *List of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum 1836-1840*.³ The first printing of a complete text followed in 1862 and was based upon the later of the two versions of the *Conduct of Life* most recently found in Egerton at folios 7'–12' with variants from the other version found at folios 64'–70'.⁴

In 1868 Morris published the first of the three editions of the *Conduct of Life* for which he is responsible. He used the text from Lambeth until it stops imperfectly, setting it out as couplets rather than the prose format that it takes in the manuscript.⁵ Morris employed Furnivall’s edition of the two texts of Egerton to complete the text found in Lambeth and to ‘[correct] the scribal blunders that it contains’.⁶ The first 272 lines of the text from Egerton folios 7'–12' are added into the Appendix.⁷ This 1868 edition is produced with a side-by-side translation of the text. In 1872 Morris produced an edition of the *Conduct of Life* based on the version found in Jesus.⁸ Placed alongside other texts from the Library at Jesus College, the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, the texts were brought together because they were

---

¹ George Hicks, *Linguarum Vetearum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus* (Oxford, 1705), 1, p. 222.
⁵ R. Morris, *Old English Homilies*, 1st series, EETS, OS 29, 34 (1867-8), pp. 159-175 (henceforth Morris 1867).
⁶ Morris 1867, p. vi.
of a religious or didactic nature. In 1873 Morris produced his final edition of the Conduct of Life – this time based upon the version found in Trinity. Morris reproduced the Conduct of Life in this edition, alongside the remainder of the homiletic material in Trinity and three thirteenth-century hymns from Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS 54 D.4.14 accompanied by music for two of them.

The text of the Conduct of Life present in Digby was not published complete until 1878 by Zupitza, although, as noted, extracts were published as early as 1705. In 1881 the first composite text, based on the six then known versions, was published by H. Lewin using the version of the Conduct of Life found in Egerton at folios 7r-12v as his base. The final version of the Conduct of Life to be discovered, the version of the text found in McClean, was transcribed by Anna C. Paues in February, 1905. Hall produced a parallel-text edition of the Conduct of Life in 1920 placing the texts found in Trinity and Lambeth, completed by Egerton from folio 12v, side-by-side. The first critical edition of the Conduct of Life based on all seven texts, and the only one to be published, was by Hans Marcus in 1934.

The most significant recent advancement to the editorial history of the Conduct of Life comes in the form of an electronic resource; all seven manuscript versions of the Conduct of Life are present and searchable on the website A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English 1150-1325 compiled by Margaret Laing and Roger Lass. This resource, which presents all variants of the verse-sermon as lexico-grammatically tagged texts, is designed for the essentially qualitative procedures of grammatical analysis and corpus linguistics; as a linguistic database,

---

9 Morris 1872, p. vii.
11 Julius Zupitza, "Zum Poema Morale", Anglia, 1 (1878), 5-32 (henceforth Zupitza 1878).
12 H. Lewin: Das Mittelenglische Poema Morale (Halle, 1881).
15 Hans Marcus: Das Frühmittelenglische "Poema Morale" (Leipzig, 1934).
therefore, it is impeccable, but its interface leaves less latitude for engagement with the texts as texts – that is, as literary and cultural artefacts, embedded in specific contexts and practices, with their own distinctive approaches to form, content and purpose.

Any study of the Conduct of Life is incomplete without acknowledging the significant contribution made by Betty Hill. In 1958 she completed her D.Phil (unpublished) at the University of Oxford, entitled An edition of the early Middle English Poema Morale with introduction and commentary. She continued by publishing widely on the verse sermon throughout her career – much of which will be discussed in relation to the individual manuscripts of the Conduct of Life. In 1977 she produced a significant article which summarises previous scholarship whilst probing areas for further research. It is, therefore, the first place to go for any study of the Conduct of Life. It concludes with a case for the new title assigned to the work – which I have adopted in view of her convincing argument for it. Hill points out that none of the previous titles of the Conduct of Life has manuscript authority, except for the late thirteenth-century rubricated title, Tractatus quidam in anglico, found at folio 169r of Jesus. She details the history of the adoption of the two most popular titles given to the text, a Moral Ode and the Poema Morale, and clearly states her objections to both, concluding that although the text may be described as “moral”, it is neither an “Ode” nor a Poema. It is an English verse-sermon. She, therefore, chooses the title the Conduct of Life as:

This title seems to me to embrace the author’s concern with Man in this Life and with the universal theme of the after-life; for he advises his listeners how to conduct their lives and instructs them as to where their lives will conduct them.

---

17 Currently closed for an unlimited period.
20 Hill 1977, p. 128.
THE MANUSCRIPTS

It is appropriate to begin an edition of the *Conduct of Life* with a presentation of the manuscripts containing the text, never before brought together in one place. This is preceded by a summary list of the manuscripts containing the text:

- Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52
- London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487
- Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4
- London, British Library MS Egerton 613
- Oxford, Jesus College MS 29 (II)
- Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123

In the descriptions which follow, dimensions are given in millimetres (height then width), with writing areas measured to the bounding lines, rather than the ends of verses or text that might have overrun. Abbreviations in the descriptions of the manuscripts have been silently expanded.
1. Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 14. 52

Parchment. s.xii²/s.xii⁴. Size of Leaves: 138 x 104.

Cambridge, Trinity College B. 14. 52 is a composite manuscript containing the *Conduct of Life* and thirty-four homilies.

1(a). Contents.

Folios i⁻⁻ ii, Doctrinal Index of contents in the hand of Abraham Whelock.²¹

Folio 1ˢ/1-21, *Litany of the Virgin* in a thirteenth-century hand.

Folio 1ˢ/1-23 and folio 1ˢ/23-31, table of contents for homilies in a sixteenth-century hand.

Folio 1ˢ/1-2, ‘Rithmus anglicus cum omilis anglicis in hoc volumine | continentur’

Inscription in a sixteenth-century hand.²²

Folio 1ˢ/4-11, ‘LECTORI, | Abdita quæe tenebrans monumenta recondidit’. Dating formula (23 September 1583) and six lines of Latin verse signed WP [William Patten?].²³ Ed. James 1900, p. 460.


I. Folios 2ˢ/1 - 9ˢ/21, Ich am nu elder þan ich pas a pintre 7 a lore. *Poema Morale* or *Conduct of Life*. IMEV 1272. DIMEV 2113. English. Ed. Morris 1873: 220-32, no. 35; Hall 1920: 31-53, no. 8; see also Hill 1977. The remainder of folio 9ˢ has been left blank.

²¹ See fn 24 below.
²² Wilcox dates the hand to the fifteenth century (Wilcox 2000) and Treharne to the sixteenth century (Treharne 2010).
²³ See Hill 1966a.


24. Folios 57r/7-60v/9, **De sancto Iohanne baptista.** | Inter natos mulierum non surrexit maior iohanne baptista. *St. John the Baptist.* English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 131-41, no. 23.


28. Folios 66v/1-69v/9, **MARia uirgo assumpta est ad ethereum thalamum 7 cetera.** *Assumption of Mary.* English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 159-67, no. 27.


[Folio 86r/17-23 blank].

35. Folios 86r/1-12, ) ...Sulphurea id est baline | balanstie id est flores malogranatorum (Line 4). Twelve lines of fifteenth-century Latin lemmata and their accompanying interpretamenta; the opening is illegible; ‘a few names explained’ James 1900: 461.

[The remainder of folio 86r and the whole of folio 87v have been left blank].


[Folio 88v/13-23 is blank except for a modern Trinity College Cambridge Library stamp and two 15th century names].

37. Folios 88v/1-15 and 90v/1-26: glossary notes in a sixteenth-century hand.
[the rest of folio 88r and all of folio 89r have been left blank].

38. Folios 89r–90v, Two-line prayer in ink along with extensive, mostly illegible, writing.

1(b). Collation.

ii + 91 + iii (foliated i-ii, 1-91, 91A-93). 18r (folios 1-9, 1 added with stub visible after folio 9), II-X8 (folios 10-81). X18 (folios 82-87, wants two in 6th and 7th position (stubs showing), blank between folios 86 and 87). XII4 (folios 88-91). The 91 folios are surrounded by a pair of sixteenth-century paper, fly-leaves, and a pair of modern fly-leaves. A slip precedes the end gathering at folio 91A.

Quire I has like surfaces facing, with flesh outside the first sheet. However, folios 2r–9v of Quire I were a later addition to the manuscript having been inserted within a bifolium sheet present in the manuscript as 1r with the stub showing between 9v and 10r (the beginning of Quire II and the homilies).24 Originally the quire of 8 would have begun with hair outside the first sheet. Quire II-XI: like surfaces facing, with flesh outside the first sheet.

1(c). Writing Grid.

The writing grid for Quire I is c. 122-127mm x 80–88mm.25 Quire 1 has between 24 and 28 lines per page.26 The writing grid for Quires II to XI is ca. 112–116mm x 86–91mm. folios 10–45r have 21 lines per page and folios 45r–86r have 23 lines per page.

---

25 At folio 3r/20 an erasure has meant that the text runs into the gutter.
26 24 lines per page at folios 2r–4r, 8r and 9r; 28 lines per page at folios 4r–5r; 26 lines per page at folios 5r–8r and folios 7r–7v and has 20 lines per page at folio 9v followed by enlarged AMEN and space for a further three lines.
1(d). Textual Presentation.

The decoration and rubrication of Quire I is different from the remainder of the manuscript. Item I begins with an enlarged red opening initial ‘I’ of four lines in height. A capital letter, written in black ink and placed in the margin, begins each line. The sermon concludes on folio 9⁷/21 with AMEN in display capitals, touched in red. Other than these features there are no other examples of display characteristics or rubrication throughout the text.

The remainder of the manuscript may also be described as relatively unadorned. However, the homilies do contain occasional rubrication in red script and some capital letters in red. The first letter of each homily is enlarged and written in either red or green. Instruction for a rubricator can be found in the gutter for several of these letters throughout the manuscript. In addition, examples of an indication, mid homily, left by the scribe to the rubricator can also be found at various points throughout the manuscript. Other signs of obscured text are evident in the gutter and can be observed at folios 14', 21' and 59'.

1(e). Scribes

The majority of the manuscript is written in two different hands which write in a similar style. The scribes change over throughout the manuscript, often at the start of a new page or part way through a page but never at the beginning of a new item. This would suggest, as Hill

---

27 22mm tall.
28 An exception to this is the first letter of Item II at folio 30'/10 which is not rubricated and begins with an enlarged black initial.
29 The best example can be found at folio 34'/15 where the letter p can be found in the gutter indicating to the rubricator that the first letter of the word Preocupemus, which begins the homily, should be enlarged and coloured (in this case a large red initial letter is used).
30 For example, at folios 63'/11 and 63'/20, V trasque and Lacrima begin Latin lines and the letters V and L can be found in the gutter. Further examples of marks for rubrication can be found at folios 21'/11, 67'/17, 68'/11, 105'/14, 20 and 21.
31 According to Ker's description of the two main hands in the manuscript, hand 1 wrote folios 2'/1-21', 23'/1-21, 36'/15-21, 38'/6-21, 66'/13-68'/11, 70'/1-71/23, 73'/1-76'/23, 78'/1-23, 79'/1-23, 80'/1-81/1, 85'/1-23; hand 2 wrote fols. 22'/1-22'/21, 23'/1-36'/15, 36'/1-38'/6, 39'/1-66'/15, 68'/11-69'/23, 71'/1-73'/1, 76'/1-77'/23, 78'/1-23, 79'/1-80'/23, 81'/23, 81'/1-85'/1, 85'/1-86'/16. Ker, p. 139.
has previously argued, that the two scribes were copying continuously from a similar compilation. 32 Ker asserts that the scribe who wrote Item I on Quire I is the same scribe who begins Quire II. 33 Wilcox, however, believes that this is 'doubtful' arguing that folios 2r-9r may have been written by a distinct third scribe whilst acknowledging that this third scribe had a 'style similar to the two main scribes.' 34 The homilies and the work of the two main scribes conclude at the end of folio 86r and a distinctly different fifteenth-century scribe writes Item 35 on folio 86v/1-12. Item 36 is written by two scribes who have similar hands to the two main scribes. 35 Treharne agrees with Ker stating that 'Hand 1, which copies the Poema Morale and the first folios of the Homilies, is relatively compressed and angular', whereas, Hand 2 is 'a much more upright and regular hand, but it is very narrow and angular.' 36

Wilcox's assertion that the scribe of Quire I is not one of the two main scribes who wrote the main body of the manuscript is not supported, it would seem, by palaeographical evidence and is based upon the premise that Quire I is a much later addition to the manuscript. Wilcox does concede that a comparison is difficult due to the different mise-en-page and size of script and cannot conclusively say that the scribes are different. 37 The distinctive letter forms present in the script of Scribe I are, from close analysis of the manuscript, also present in Quire I. The assertion that Quire I of the manuscript is a later addition does not abrogate the possibility that the scribe of Quire I is also one of the main hands responsible for the remainder of the manuscript. Any difference in ductus could be attributed to a passage of time between

32 Hill 1966a, p. 192.
33 Ker's identification of the two main scribes of the manuscript is based on their distinctly different forms of the letter ð and the abbreviation 7 (tironian nota). N. R. Ker, “The Scribes of the ‘Trinity Homilies’.” Medium Aevum 1 (1932), p. 138-140.
35 One scribe wrote folio 87v/1-14 and the other folios 87v/14 - 88r/12.
36 Treharne makes several other key points of comparison, which can be found in her edition. Of the individual letter forms she states of Hand 1 that 'g is Caroline for the stop, and insular five-shaped g for the spirant'. Whereas, in Hand 2, 'g is exclusively Caroline, with a rounded tail which flicks sharply down to the right in a hairstroke at the end.' In addition Treharne says of Hand 2 that 'the most notable characteristic distinguishing this hand is the crossed and squiggly 7'. Treharne 2010.
37 Wilcox, p. 18.
the writing of Quire I and the remainder of the manuscript, possible different purposes for the manuscript or, as Wilcox claims himself, the different mis-en-page and size of script. The similarities in letter formation suggest that it is the same hand. It may also give a possible reason for the inclusion of the *Conduct of Life* in a homiliary.

**1(f). The *Conduct of Life* as a distinct unit.**

Quire I (folios 2r to 9v) should be viewed as a self-contained unit. This unit is not only different in layout but also in content from the rest of the manuscript: it contains a verse-sermon in septenary rhyming couplets as opposed to the remainder of the manuscript which is made up of homilies which roughly follow the liturgical year. The size of script is larger; it has a different number of lines per page and it occupies a larger writing grid. As a result of this it has suffered more from cropping than any of the other items in the manuscript. The first quire is not part of the sixteenth-century foliation or the seventeenth-century pagination and is not included in the sixteenth-century table of contents or in Whelock’s seventeenth-century index. In addition, the second quire begins with its own sixteenth-century title, which, as Wilcox states, ‘might suggest that the first quire was not in its present place until after the 17c’. However, as Wilcox finds, the opening folio must have been in its present position when it received the sixteenth-century table of contents and probably when it gained the inscription at the head of folio 1v.

Ivy suggests that it is likely that folios 2r–9v originally formed a quire of eight which was placed inside a bifolium. The bifolium, between which the verse-sermon was inserted, is folio

---

38 The enlarged capitals which begin each line are missing from the outer margins at: 6v/8-26, 7v/24-26, 8v/6+9-14+16-24, 9v/2-11+13-20. See also Treharne 2010 and Wilcox 2000, p. 17.
39 Wilcox 2000, p. 17.
1 of the manuscript and can be detected again as a stub showing between 9v and 10r. Wilcox establishes further proof that the verse-sermon originally occupied a quire of eight which was then placed inside a bifolium through the wormholes found in the opening folios. The quire signature at the end of quire VII adds further weight to this argument – the signature reads ‘VI’ when it is in fact the 7th gathering of the manuscript.

1(g). Pagination and Filiation

There are three forms of pagination/foliation visible throughout the manuscript. The modern pencil foliation numbers the Litany of the Virgin (folio 1ra/1–21) as 1 and is marked on the recto of every folio. It marks the beginning of the Conduct of Life as 2 and the beginning of the homilies as 10. It must have been recently completed and corrected, as, at the time of Hill’s article folio 3 was not paginated, 5 was repeated for 6, 6 for 7 etc till 10 where the folios were numbered every 10 for the remainder of the manuscript. The manuscript is now numbered correctly on every recto throughout the whole of the manuscript. There is brown ink pagination on the second folio of the homilies (folio 11r) which is numbered 3 and continues on the recto of each leaf 5, 7, 9 etc. to page 161 (folio 90). There is also a black ink foliation, occasionally visible due to cropping, starting with the first page of the homilies.

41 68mm down the outer margin of folio 2 there is a wormhole which continues to folio 3. There is, however, no corresponding hole in folio 1. There are also two wormholes on folio 1 which are not present on folio 2. The first is 5mm down the page and approximately 11mm in from the gutter. The second is within the outer margin, 58mm from the top (Wilcox 2000, p. 17). It should also be noted here, not recorded in Wilcox’s study, that there are two wormholes on the stub between folio 9r and folio 10v which are not present on either of adjacent folios.

42 Hill 1966a, p. 192.

43 The best example of where this is visible is at folio 49r (folio 58r according to modern pencil foliation).
1(h). Contemporary and later additions

There is little evidence within the manuscript of contemporary use. There is some error correction in darker ink at folios 78r/9, 80r/16, 83r/17 and 20 and some of the blank spaces within the manuscript have been used for thirteenth-century additions. At folio 1r/1-21 there begins the Litany of the Virgin in a thirteenth-century hand. A homily on Isaiah has been added in a thirteenth-century hand at folios 87v/1 - 88r/12. There are three examples of faded Latin text at the bottom of the page at folios 33r-34r, 47r-48r and 55r. There is also evidence, although very faded, of what James believes to be thirteenth-century prayers written in pencil on folios 89r-90r.44

There are also some examples of later additions within the manuscript. At folio 1r there is a fifteenth-century inscription which reads ‘Rithmus anglicus cum omilis anglicis in hoc volumine | continentur’. The two names ‘Ser Thomas Stone (or Stow)’ and ‘Ser John Newson (or John Newbore)’ can be found on the blank page at folio 88r. The heading ‘Rithmus Anglicus’ in a possibly sixteenth-century hand has been added to folio iiv. The blank space on folio 1r has been used for a sixteenth-century table of contents which is linked to the homilies through the early foliation. On folio 1’ there is a form of astrological dating which is followed by six lines of Latin; signed W.P or W.L.45 At the bottom of the same folio there is a truncated letter. At the top of folio 10r there is the later heading ‘Homiliae Anglicæ’. The lack of inclusion of quire I in the sixteenth-century table of contents and the inclusion of a later title at folio 10r adds support to the idea that quire I, as discussed previously, did not originally occupy its present position; as does the doctrinal index found on the flyleaves in the hand of Abraham James 1900, p. 462.

44 The astrological dating has been interpreted by Hill as being 23 September 1583 which corresponds to the date given of Archbishop Whitgift’s enthronement at Canterbury and is in the hand of Thomas Patten (William Patten’s son). Hill also contends that the ‘Yor Grace’ which begins the truncated letter at the bottom of the page is Archbishop Whitgift although it is written in an unknown hand. It is likely that the initials, therefore, are W[illiam] P[atten], although, the hand itself is of his son, Thomas Patten. (Hill 1966a, pp. 195-200).
Whelock. The index runs from A-J on folios i'-ii' and from K-Z on folios 91r-93r. The index refers only to the homilies and to the earlier pagination and not to Quire I, adding further weight to the argument that the distinct quire did not occupy its current position until after the seventeenth century. The entries in the table are connected to the pointers and underlining throughout the remainder of the manuscript. As well as underlining and pointers being added throughout the manuscript, Hill also notes the use of five sigla keyed to the text throughout the manuscript.

Hill believes that the hand which is responsible for the table of contents linked to the thirty-one homilies, on folio 1r, was apparently also responsible for the gloss Manca Mancus to manke folio 3r (Conduct of Life, line 70). If this is the case then it would suggest that Quire I was in its present position when the table was produced and that, for some reason, it was left out of the contents. It is not unfeasible, although less likely, however, for the ‘distinct unit’ which is Quire I to have come under the hand of the glosser at a separate time, although, possibly at the same place.

Hill also recognises six different sixteenth-century hands responsible for English and Latin glosses in the Conduct of Life, Homilies and the Sermon on Isaiah. She divides and provides a description to the glosses as follows: The Conduct of Life is underlined and glossed on folio 2v aihte-goodes (line 42), folio 3v ore-favoor grace (line 53), lean-dezerving (line 64). The words africh (line 65) and manke (line 70) are underlined but not glossed. There are

---

46 According to Hill: Whelocke was at Trinity College from 1611 to 1619. He was Cambridge University Librarian from 1629 to 1653 and in 1640 Anglo-Saxon Lecturer on the Sir Henry Spelman foundation. Whelocke sent transcripts of parts of Ælfric’s canons (MS. Harley 440) to Spelman, who in 1637 requested him to compare and note references to ‘the marriages of priests, virginity &c.’ of the Nicene Council which Ælfric cites and follows. It is apparent from the table, which, in a note on the flyleaf ii, Mr H. M. Adams attributed to Whelocke, that he extended his studies to Middle English. (Hill 1966a, p. 194).
47 Hill is uncertain whether Whelocke is responsible for these pencilled pointers and underlining or if they were added at a later point using Whelock’s doctrinal index (Hill 1966a, p. 194). However, Timothy Graham confirms this hand is Whelocke’s in a personal communication with Elaine Treharne (Treharne 2010).
49 The following and fuller description can be found in Hill 1966a, pp. 193-194.
English and Latin glosses to the *Homilies* at folios 10r-12r, 20v-26r, 27r, 43r, 47r, 65v, 66r, 66v, 74v and 75v. There are two heavily cropped marginal Latin comments on the *Homilies* at folio 66r/1+9. Folio 88r (Sermon on Isaiah) contains one interlinear gloss *gerde-virga* and two badly cropped marginal glosses. Hill establishes that a fourth hand was responsible for marginal glosses on folios 59v, 60r, 62r, 67r, 69r, 70r, 72r, 75r, 76r, 77r, 77v, 78r, 80r, 81r, 83r, 84r, 85r and 86r. She contends that these glosses were made after cropping had taken place and during rebinding. A cross-reference to the gloss on folio 84r shows that the glossator was working whilst the brown ink pagination was in use. The interlinear glosses can be found on fols. 55r, 59r, 68r, 68v, 69r, 73r, two on 75v, 76r, 76v, 77v and 84r. A fifth hand adds the interlinear gloss *abroidene bureh-ruinosam vrbem* and a sixth hand writes *Sax: ærendraca- nuntius*, longwise in the margin of folio 20v.

1(i). Provenance.

What is known of the provenance and early history of the manuscript is extremely limited. According to Hill, the manuscript may have received some of its glosses whilst in the care of Archbishop Parker and was probably held at some point by William Patten. Hill 1966a, p. 195 John Whitgift, who became Archbishop on 23 September 1583, bequeathed the manuscript to Trinity College in 1604. It is his coat of arms on the covers and it is he who is most probably responsible for the manuscript’s present binding. Abraham Whelocke’s doctrinal index has been noted; he may also have been responsible for some of the pointers and underlining throughout the manuscript. Treharne 2010 The manuscript was repaired and rebound in 1984 by Cockerell.

---

51 Hill 1966a, p. 195
52 Treharne 2010
Although, as discussed, Quire I did not originally occupy its present position until a date after the manuscript was originally put together, it is probable that the hand that writes Quire I also contributed to the remainder of the manuscript. When Quire I and the rest of the manuscript were brought together is still debatable, although its absence from both the contents and the doctrinal index suggest that it may not have occupied its present position until after the beginning of the seventeenth century. It is likely, however, that it did occupy its current place in the manuscript by the time of binding later in the seventeenth century.

1(j). Binding.

The manuscript is bound calf over pulp and, as noted above, embossed with John Whitgift’s coat of arms (the See of Canterbury impaling Argent a cross flury with four bezants), in gold on front and back. The manuscript was probably re-bound between 1583 and 1604 when Whitgift was Archbishop of Canterbury. Previous to this Whitgift had been Master of Trinity College between 1567 and 1577, to which he bequeathed the manuscript. There are fittings for two clasps and ‘Homiliae Anglicæ’ is toold on the spine. There is a modern binder’s note on the final flyleaf, which states:

Binder’s note | B. 14. 52 | DC680 Condition when received: binding rebacked | dark brown calf, over pulp boards, a very heavy | impression of arms in gold on both boards, most | of the gold missing, two clasps clasping on the | back board, crossovers missing, red lettering | piece. Book sewn on white thongs, thongs | broken, sewing broken, gatherings free, vellum | leaves in good condition though very heavily | cropped, coloured edges. | Book taken down, damaged leaves guarded and | repaired, resewn on four cords to the old | marking up. The old boards repaired and laced | on. The spine covered with brown calf. | SMC | Cockerall Bindery | October 1984.

53 Hill 1966a, p. 192.
1(k). Shelf Marks.

On folio i’ the old shelf mark of Trinity, R. 15. 17, has been crossed through and replaced below by the modern shelf mark B. 14. 52. Further down the same folio R. 15. 17 has once more been erased. Modern stamps of Trinity College Library can be found on folio 1’, folio 10’, folio 20’, folio 49’, folio 86’ and folio 88’. At folio 91A there is a half page slip stating that ‘This book belongs to Trinity College Library in Cambridge.’

1(l). Surrogate Descriptions.

James 1900; Treharne 2010; Wilcox 2000.
London, Lambeth Palace Library 487 is a composite collection of seventeen anonymous homilies, which roughly follow the liturgical year, and a version of the *Conduct of Life*.  

2(a). Contents.  

Folio iii\(^v\), Table of contents (seventeenth-century).  


15. Folios 54r/8 - 56r/9, [Q]Vi uult ueníet post me. abneget semet ipsum | & tollat crucem suam & sequatur me. wa is | þet wa is 7 me him mare bihat. Sermon on Mark VIII. 34. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 145-49, no. 15.


18. Folios 59v/5 - 65r/11, [ ]ich em nu alder þene ich wes a wintre 7 | a lare. Ich welde mare

19. Folios 65r/1 - 67r/29, Iesu soð god. godes sone. iesu soð god. soð mon. mon | maidene

2(b). Collation.

iii + 68 + iii (folios i-iii 1a, 1, 2-68 - final fly sheets not foliated). I12 (folios 1a, 1, 2-11), II14 (folios 12-25), III18 (folios 26-43), IV8 (folios 44-51), V8 (folios 52-59), VI8 (folios 60-67).

All quires are arranged with like surfaces facing and with hair on the outside.

2(c). Writing Grid.

The writing grid is 146-158mm (except at folio 59v where it is 164) x 79-94mm. For the majority of the manuscript it is consistently 80-82mm – irregularities occur toward the end of the manuscript, where the grid increases to a width of up to 95mm in places.54

There are double binding lines throughout the manuscript with some text extending beyond the grid, especially in the final item, a later addition, where the grid is irregular, more faded and not as well drawn.

The writing grid is lineated in ink55 for between 26 and 32 lines per page, with the average being 28.56 The pricking and ruling for the writing grid is visible throughout the manuscript.57

54 Folios 52r-54r: 95mm; folio 55r: 90mm; folio 55v: 94mm; folios 56r-57r: 92mm; and folio 60r: 75mm.
55 The first few pages are also incised in drypoint as well as ink. See Wilcox 2000, p. 73 and Swan 2010.
2(d). Textual Presentation.

Most of the rubrics and Latin quotations are written in red throughout the manuscript by the main scribe, with the exception of Item I and some of Item 2 where they are black. Item 10 and 18 contain further rubrication, with certain capitals in English and the Latin name of each sin in Item 10 written in red, along with important English phrases in Item 18. There is often a space left for what is likely to have been a decorated initial letter at the beginning of each item that was never written (often the guide letters are evident).

2(e). Scribes.

The majority of the manuscript (folios 1r–65r) is written by one scribe, s.xii/xiii, with a later hand, s.xiii
med, being responsible for Item 19 on folios 65v–67r.58

Variations in orthography in the hand of the main scribe have suggested to Sisam that the manuscript contains materials that have been copied from, with the exception of the thirteenth century text, two different exemplars.59 She contends that the scribe faithfully

---

58 There are 28 lines per page at folios 1r–1v, 2v, 3r–11v, 12r–13v, 14r–15v, 16r–25v, 27r–30v, 31r–32v, 35r–36v, 37r–38v and 40r–42v. There are 27 lines per page at folios 1v–2v, 3r–11v, 12r–13v, 14r–15v, 16r–25v, 27r–30v, 31r–32v, 35r–36v, 37r–38v and 40r–42v. There are 27 lines per page at folios 1v–2v, 3r–11v, 12r–13v, 14r–15v, 16r–25v, 27r–30v, 31r–32v, 35r–36v, 37r–38v and 40r–42v. There are 29 lines per page at folios 13r–14v, 15r–16v, 26r–27v, 30r–31v, 32v–34v, 38v–39v, 42v–43v and 67v. There are 30 lines per page at folio 66v. There are 31 lines per page at folios 50v–51v and 65r–66r. There are 32 lines per page at folios 44v–50v.

59 Swan believes the manuscript was ‘Most likely ruled quire by quire, and in some places possibly opening by opening after quires assembled, since this would account for uneven number of lines across bifolia.’ (Swan 2010).
transcribed his material alternately from two different manuscripts. Sisam believes that items 1-5 and 9-13, which she names Group A, show certain orthographical characteristics, while Items 7, 8, 14–16, and the Conduct of Life, which she names Group B, show others. However, Item 6, The Lord’s Prayer, has features of orthography which it shares with both groups, although, she does assign it to Group B after providing the evidence for either reading. Sisam puts forward two alternatives for the transcription of the homilies and the Conduct of Life; the first is that the Lambeth scribe had before him a single manuscript written by two different scribes or, the second, that he had two manuscripts that he drew on alternately. She claims that the second is more likely with the scribes changing over mid-item.

Sisam believes that the texts that are in Group A come from one manuscript and the texts in Group B come from another. The orthographical evidence suggests that the manuscript in which the Group A texts were found is older in origin than the manuscript that holds the group B texts. This is corroborated by the fact that included in Group A are Items 9 and 10, which are derived from Ælfric, with Item 11 including a further extract from Ælfric, and Item 2, which adapts a homily from Wulfstan.

Swan believes that instances of adaptation of the source material, specifically that of Ælfric, present in Lambeth, rather than being an attempt to make the homilies intelligible to a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century audience, more likely reflects ‘the use of memoralized reproduction in at least one stage of the textual transmission process.’

---

60 Sisam 1951, pp. 106-107.
2(f). Pagination and Foliation.

The manuscript is foliated in pencil i-iii on the flyleaves and then 1a, 1, 2-67 at the top right corner of the rectos in ink. The first folio was omitted and added as 1a, in pencil, after the mistake. The same pencilled hand repeats some of the numbering on the mending strip (see section on ‘Condition’), such as on folio 4r and folio 11r. It is probable that the foliation was added after at least some of the mending strips as, at folios 9r and 11r, it is written on the strip itself rather than the original parchment. The quires are marked, incorrectly, in the bottom right corner of the recto which corresponds to the incorrect quiring described by James.\(^64\)

2(g). Contemporary and later additions.

Various corrections are made to the manuscript in the hand of the main scribe by subpuncting, crossing through and supplying missing text in the margin.\(^65\)

2(h). Provenance.

Very little can be determined about the provenance of this manuscript before the seventeenth century when it was donated to Lambeth Palace Library by Archbishop Richard Bancroft (Archbishop of Canterbury 1604-1610).\(^66\) The manuscript was moved to Cambridge at some point between 1649 and 1664 where it received the shelf mark ‘#. C. Θ. 12’ found on the inside cover.\(^67\) On the manuscript’s return to Lambeth it was catalogued a further three times and was given the shelf mark ‘4\(^{10}\) 185’, once more found on the inside cover.\(^68\) Wilcox believes that the inclusion of Item 19, ‘An Orison of Our Lord’, ‘might suggest suggest female ownership

\(^{64}\) James collation reads: 1\(^{10}\) 2\(^{10}\) 3\(^{10}\) 4\(^{10}\) 5\(^{10}\) 6\(^{10}\) (wants 10). (James 1925, p. 673).

\(^{65}\) These are detailed in Wilcox 2000, p. 74.

\(^{66}\) It is listed in two catalogues of his manuscripts dated 15 October 1612. See, Hill 1970–72, p. 271 and Wilcox 2000, p. 73.

\(^{67}\) Hill 1970–72, pp. 271-2.

\(^{68}\) Hill 1970–72, p. 272.
of the book in the Middle Ages as it belongs to a body of religious literature ‘written for (and perhaps, in some cases, by) devout women’.

2(i). Binding.

The manuscript is sewn securely into a thick leaf of parchment with hairside out, probably of the seventeenth century. Two paper bifolia have been cut down to fit the manuscript and inserted to form the fly-leaves at folios i-ii and folios 69-70. They are taken from Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa theologica*, 2, ii, leaf sig. a, printed by Peter Schoeffer of Mainz in March 1467. The leaves are bound upside down at folios i-ii and the correct way at folios 69-70.

2(j). Condition.

The folios have been fixed with mending strips, which run down the outside of the folios. The original width would have been ca. 127 – as at folios 1 and 2 where the mending strips are missing. That they were once present is indicated by the marks left on the parchment where they were attached. Other than this the condition of the manuscript is generally good.

2(k). Shelf Marks.

The marks ‘487’ and ‘8’ are written on the spine of the binding. On the inside cover of the manuscript there are two older shelf marks; ‘#. C. Θ. 12’ and ‘4*10 185’. Further shelf marks can be found in the margin of folio 1r.

---

69 Wilcox 2000, p. 72.
70 Thompson 1958, p. xv.
71 Wilcox 2000, p. 75.
72 Hill 1970-72, p. 271.
2(l). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 1970-72 makes additions to James 1925; James 1925; Swan 2010; and Wilcox 2000.
3. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4

Parchment. s.xii/s.i/xx/s.xili. Size of Leaves: 115 x 90.

Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4 is a small composite manuscript made up of individual booklets, containing a mixture of twelfth- and thirteenth-century liturgical, theological and medical works as well as Latin and French satirical verse, which were brought together by the early fourteenth century.

3(a). Contents.

1. Folios 1r-30v, VERE | DIGNVM | et justum est. ‘Tractatus super canonem Misse Thome de Stureya’. Latin.

2. Six poems by the twelfth-century Canon, Gautier de Chatillon, written as prose. Latin and French.

   i. Folios 31r-32r, Propter syon non tacebo. sed ruinam rome flebo. Walther 14838. Strecker no. 2.


---

74 This item, according to Hill 1970-72, p. 274; Approximates to the treatise by Odo, Bishop of Cambrai 1105-†1113, extant with his preface in B.M. MS Royal II B ii (assigned by Ker (n. 6), p. 208, to Worcester), 181r-195v, and printed in J. P. Migne, Patrologia Latina, cxc, cols 1053-70. A version which, like item 1 above, lacks the preface – MS. Royal 8 A xxi (rejected by Ker (n. 6), p. 92, as a Gloucester book), 154r-157v – shows greater textual deviation.


4. Folios 40\', Duas nativitates ueneramur in Christo. unam ex patre | ante secula. 13 lines of prose explaining the two, paternal and maternal, births of Christ. Latin.

5. Folios 41\' - 47\', Twenty paragraphs of theological varia, divided into three parts. Includes the death of Isobeth, the insignia of the tribes of Israel, the power of the Cross, and the theological significance of gems. Latin.

i. ¶Uenientes filii remmon berochite. recha 7 bālñah ingressi sunt (begins on 41\'r/1).

ii. ¶Erubesce sidon ait mare. In sidone quippe | figuratur stabilitas (begins on 41\'/19).

iii. ¶Modestia incessus uiri religiosi quibusdam conatibus exigit ut diligi etiam a nolente debeat (Part III: 42\'r/9).

---

75 According to Hill 1970-72, p. 274. Sixteen are extant in the late 12\textsuperscript{th}-century collection Floregium Morale Oxoniense (MS. Bodley 633, rejected by Ker (n. 6), p. 208, as a Worcester Book). Correspondences are given to page and line of C. H. Talbot's edition in Analecta Medievalia Nanurcensis. Pt. 6 (1956): 38\', paras. 1, 2; 39\', paras 4, 9; 39\', para. 6; Seneca, ‘Moral Epistles to Lucilius’, Talbot 50/7-20, 42/18, 122/20, 39\', paras. 12-14; 40\', paras. 1-4, 13; Publilius Syrus, Talbot 124/16, 118/7, 55/11, 62/5 and 157/7, 164/5, 64/13, 145/16, 61/4. 40\', paras. 10, 12, 14: pseudo-Seneca, Talbot 127/14, 72/20, 65/6.

[Item 6 is completed on folio 96r in a different, later hand, leaving folio 96v blank].

7. Folios 97r - 110v/9, Ich am elder þanne ic pes | a pintre 7 a lore | ic ealdi more þanne ic dede | mi pit oȝhte to bi more. ‘Poema Morale’ or Conduct of Life IMEV 1272. DIMEV 2113. English. Ed. Zupitza 1878.


[Folio 111r blank]


3(b). Collation.

ii (flyleaves) + vi (quire a) + 114 + 2 (stubs - part of final quire): foliated i-viii, 1-114. 

a⁶ (folios iii-viii), b-c⁸ (folios 1-16), d⁶ (folios 17-22), e⁸ (folios 23-30), f-g¹⁰ (folios 31-47 + 3 blank folios not numbered), h-m⁸ (folios 48-95), n¹² (folios 96 + 11 blank folios not numbered), o¹⁶ (folios 97-112), p⁴ (folios 113-114 + 2 folios excised).
3(c). Writing Grid.

Digby should be considered a series of individual items brought together by a later compiler. The entirety of the first gathering, Quire a, has been left blank and un-ruled. Item I (folios 1r-30v) begins on the recto of the first folio of Quire b and concludes on the verso of the final folio of Quire e. The writing grid is ca. 90mm x 60mm, with little variation. The grid is ruled in single column with double bounding lines enclosing the grid at the inner and outer margins, with the right-hand margin often written over. The item is consistently ruled for 20 lines per page, with the exception of folio 1r (19 lines) which begins the piece, and folio 30v where five lines conclude the piece and where it is impossible, because of fading, to determine for how many lines the page was initially ruled. The remainder of folio 30v has been left blank.

Items 2-4 (folios 31r-40v) are contained within Quire f and are all written in the same hand. These items occupy a similar size writing grid to Item I with the grid, however, enclosed by a single bounding line at each margin.76 Throughout this quire, pricking is clearly visible at the outer edges of the folios for both horizontal and vertical lines.77 The grid is ruled for 25 lines per page with text written above the top line. On folio 40r the grid is ruled for 25 lines with only 22 lines being used to conclude Item 3, with the rest of the page left blank. Similarly, on folio 40v, where Item 4 begins and concludes, only 13 lines of the ruled grid have been used, with the remainder left blank. The six poems which make up Item 2 are written continuously, one after each other, without a line gap. Item 3 begins on the first line of folio 38v, and Item 4 begins and ends on folio 40v.

Item 5 occupies the entirety of Quire g. The writing grid for Item 5 is consistently 80mm x 60mm, except at folio 45v where it is 76mm x 60mm, and where there are only 18

76 The pricking, however, is present for double bounding lines.
77 The clearest example is at folio 32r.
lines per page as opposed to the normal 19. The only other place where the text deviates from the more regular 19 lines per page is at folio 47\(^v\) where the text concludes after 17 lines, although the ruling for the additional two lines is present. The grid is not clear from the first folio of Quire g, although later folios do show a grid enclosed on both sides by sets of double bounding lines. The text often spills into the right hand ruled margin.

Item 6 begins on folio 48\(^r\), the first folio of Quire h, and concludes on folio 95\(^v\), the final folio of Quire m. The writing grid varies from 80-92mm x ca. 60mm; the grid is not always clear.\(^78\) The grid is enclosed by two sets of parallel vertical bounding lines and is placed close to the gutter of the folio. The horizontal lines are extended from the grid to the outer edge of the folio where pricking is often visible.\(^79\) Pricking is also often visible, for the vertical lines, at the head and foot of the folios. The main text is placed within the grid, whilst marginal glosses (in the same hand) are placed on the lines in the exterior space. On the verso of the folios the process is the reverse, with the glosses placed on the left hand side with the ruled grid, once more, set close to the gutter. The glosses often overlap the grid, which is never fully utilised.\(^80\)

The number of lines per page varies in number from 21 lines to 26 lines per page.\(^81\) Item 6 has been completed on folio 96\(^r\) (the first folio of Quire n) in a later hand. Folio 96\(^v\) has been left blank and is followed by a further 11 blank folios completing Quire n.

Item 7 begins on folio 97\(^r\), the first folio of Quire o, and runs until folio 110\(^v/9\). The writing grid measures 102-105mm x 48-50mm. The grid runs down the centre of the folio to the very bottom with significant spaces left on either side. It is enclosed on either side by a single bounding line. Item 7 is written in half-lines with every initial letter of a couplet (every

\(^{78}\) The best examples of its layout can be seen on folios 56\(^r\)-56\(^v\) and folio 95\(^r\).

\(^{79}\) See, for example, folio 95\(^r\).

\(^{80}\) See, for example, folio 95\(^r\).

\(^{81}\) Folio 48\(^r\) has 21 lines per page; folios 48\(^r\)-55\(^v\) have 23 lines per page; folios 56\(^r\)-68\(^v\), 64\(^r\)-68\(^v\), 69\(^r\)-77\(^v\), 78\(^r\), 79\(^r\)-87\(^v\) have 24 lines per page; folios 69\(^r\), 78\(^r\), 88\(^r\)-96\(^r\) have 25 lines per page; folios 64\(^r\) and 77\(^r\) have 26 lines per page.
4th line) capitalized and placed outside the grid. The text is written above the top line. Item 7 concludes on line 9 with the title for Item 8 following directly after on line 10. The *Conduct of Life* has 28 lines per page throughout, except at folio 110v where it concludes on line 9 and is followed by a title for Item 8, a one line gap and then a further 16 lines, giving a total of 27 lines.

Item 8 ignores the left-hand vertical line of the previous item and begins close to the gutter of the folio. The item continues for a further 16 lines (main body of text) and almost to the bottom of the folio - although the final line is not written on. Folio 111v is blank.

Item 9 begins on folio 111r and concludes on the recto of the following folio. The writing grid is 98mm x ca. 80mm and is ruled for 26 lines, although there are only 14 lines of verse on folio 112r spread across 17, as the writing often goes across two lines as the scribe becomes inconsistent. The grid is ruled from the left-hand edge of the folios to a vertical line that signifies the right hand edge of the ruled grid. Folio 112v has been left blank.

Quire p, which is made up of two folios followed by two stubs, has been left blank except for the modern numbering at folios 113v and 114v.

3(d). Textual Presentation.

Item I begins with an enlarged, ornate and decorated letter D in blue with a red floral interior, red disks and red tendrils; the remainder of the word, ‘DIGNVM’, is capitalized and coloured green. Other ‘key words’ in the incipit are also capitalized and coloured green or red.\(^{82}\)

---

\(^{82}\) See VERE (Line 1) and GRATISS (line 7).
There are further occasional examples of rubrication and illuminated letters throughout this item.\(^83\)

Initial letters of words beginning sentences are capitalized, single-line height, coloured red or green alternately, and set in the ruled left hand margin.\(^84\) Later in the same item these initial letters alternate between red and blue,\(^85\) alternate between red and black,\(^86\) and are written in red only.\(^87\) Some of the initial letters that begin sentences have also been given flourishes.\(^88\) In addition, a considerable number of sentences throughout the item are underlined in red to draw attention to their significance.

Each of the Items 2i-2vi begin with an enlarged letter, two lines, in red, with tendrils and further examples of decoration extending from the ascenders or descendents.\(^89\) Each of the items is linked by the word ‘Alia’, written in red at the conclusion of the previous item, but corresponding to the next.\(^90\) There are also three occasions within Items 2i-2vi where an enlarged terronian nota, touched red in two instances, can be found in the margin at the beginning of an item.\(^91\) Further capital letters in Item 2i are also often touched red. At the conclusion to Item 2 (folio 38/25) ‘explic’ has been written in black ink and then crossed through in red.

\(^{83}\) Folio 3\(^3/\)17-18: ‘explics | pyodus. incip. u.’ in red; folio 3\(^3/\)18: enlarged ‘P’, decorated and coloured green; folio 8\(^7/\)15 incipit in red; folio 8\(^7/\)16: enlarged ‘T’ in red with decorated tendrils; folio 26\(^6/\)16: half line gap, possibly left for an incipit that was never added; folio 26\(^6/\)16-17: enlarged, inset, ‘h’ in red; folio 29\(^7/\)5-6: enlarged, inset letter ‘P’ in red; folio 30\(^7/\)9: ‘AMUS’ is spread along the line in capitals; 30\(^7/\)10-11: enlarged letter ‘S’ in red.
\(^{84}\) This continues throughout the item, although the writing is continuous so that the initial letter of a sentence often does not fall at the start of a new line, but still remains capitalized and coloured. There are occasions where initial letters have been added in black, most likely by mistake or because the rubricator has missed a guide letter, see, for example, folio 2 Line 1, folio 23 Lines 15, 16 and 17.
\(^{85}\) Folio 19\(^9/\) - folio 2\(^1/\); folio 22\(^\) - folio 2\(^4/\); folio 25\(^9/\) - folio 2\(^7/\); folio 28\(^9/\) - folio 2\(^9/\).
\(^{86}\) Folio 24\(^9/\).
\(^{87}\) Folio 27\(^7/\), folio 28\(^9/\), and for part of folio 28\(^9/\).
\(^{88}\) See, for example, ‘U’ on folio 6/ Line 1 and ‘P’ on Line 7; ‘t’ on folio 12/ Line 19, and two examples of ‘p’ on Line 20; ‘A’ on folio 13 Line 9 and ‘p’ on Line 20.
\(^{89}\) Folio 31/4: ‘P’, extending above the top line and with the stem descending down the outside of the grid with a tendril extending from its finish that turns into a flourish of flowers; folio 32/4: ‘M’ set into the text at the left hand margin, with the left-hand leg and foot descending down the margin, finishing with a flourish; folio 33/20: ‘M’ set into the text at the left hand margin; folio 35/21: ‘B’ set into the text at the left-hand margin; folio 36/8: ‘N’ set into the text with a tale that runs down the margin; folio 37/9: ‘A’ set into the text with a foot that descends down the margin and ends with a flourish.
\(^{90}\) Folio 32/8; folio 33/19; folio 35/20; folio 36/7; folio 37/8.
\(^{91}\) Folio 33\(^9/\); the top right of folio 35\(^9/\); folio 36\(^8/\) (not touched in red).
Each of the *sententiae* of Item 3, which begins on folio 38\(^v\)/1, begin with a paragraph mark ‘¶’ or variant thereof, touched in red, with some of the capitals for this item also touched red. Item 4, which begins and ends on folio 40\(^v\) has no decoration or rubrication.

Item 5 is made up twenty paragraphs of theological *varia*. Each of these paragraphs begins with a capitalized initial letter, placed in the left-hand margin and a paragraph mark placed outside the grid to indicate each new beginning.\(^{92}\)

Item 6, folios 48\(^r\)-95\(^v\), begins with an enlarged letter ‘H’, three lines high, in red with an ascender reaching up the page. Further enlarged, usually of two lines, and coloured letters begin new sections throughout the item, alternating between either red and green, or red and blue, with further occasional decoration of ascenders and descenders. Marks for the rubricator can also be found accompanying many of these initial letters.\(^{93}\) In addition to these initial letters, folio 48\(^r\) has variations on the paragraph mark written in the gutter of the folio. If not illuminated then the initial letter of each line is capitalized and placed similarly within the first set of vertical ruled lines.\(^{94}\)

Item 7 begins with an enlarged letter ‘I’, positioned outside of the grid and running down the folio, in red. Every initial letter of the couplet (every fourth line as the piece is written in half lines) is capitalized, touched red and set outside of the writing grid. The final line of the item, folio 110\(^r\)/9, is A-M-E-N, capitalized and spread across the line. Item 8 has no decoration or rubrication.

---

\(^{92}\) These initials and paragraph marks can be located at: folio 41\(^r\)/1; folio 41\(^v\)/19; folio 42\(^r\)/9, 11, 14 and 18; folio 43\(^r\)/1 and 13; folio 44\(^r\)/6, folio 44\(^v\)/1, 8 and 12; folio 45\(^r\)/1, 6 and 12; folio 46\(^r\)/4; folio 46\(^v\)/6 and 16; folio 47\(^r\)/7; and folio 47\(^v\)/6.

\(^{93}\) For example, ‘H’ on folio 52\(^v\)/14; ‘N’ on folio 55\(^r\)/12; ‘M’ on folio 57\(^r\)/13; ‘Y’ on folio 58\(^r\)/13; ‘I’ on folio 76\(^r\)/1 etc.

\(^{94}\) See the section on ‘Writing Grid’ for a description of the marginal glosses which are an integral part of the layout and presentation of this item.
Item 9 is made up of quatrains with the first and fourth lines linked by a wavy joining line in the same hand. Furthermore, the second and third lines of the quatrains are similarly linked by another pair of lines extending from the grid.

3(e). Scribes.

Digby contains eight hands according to Hill and corroborated by my own research:95 Hand A writes Item 1; Hand B writes Items 2-4; Hand C writes Item 5, Hand D writes Item 6 which is completed by Hand E; Hand F writes Item 7; Hand G writes Item 8 and Hand H writes Item 9. Ker dates Hand D to the early twelfth century; Hand A to the late 12th century and the other six hands to the early thirteenth century.96

Each of the main texts within the manuscript occupies its own quire(s) with Items 8 and 9 being added to the blank folios left at the conclusion to Item 7. This, alongside the differing mis-en-page and the different scribes of the Digby Manuscript, suggests that the texts were not brought together until a later date. The individual texts should, therefore, be viewed, in the first instance, as pamphlets or individual units that have been brought together by a later compiler.

3(f). Pagination and Foliation.

The manuscript is numbered throughout in modern Arabic numerals beginning with the 2nd quire, Quire b, where Item I begins. The two parchment fly leaves and the first quire, Quire a, are marked with Roman numerals. An even later hand than that which was responsible for the modern pagination of the remainder of the manuscript completes the numbering on the blank folios 113-114.

95 Hill 1970-72, p. 274.
96 Hill 1970-72, p. 274.
3(g). Contemporary and later additions.

The manuscript is relatively unadorned with few contemporary or later additions. Those present are set out below:

A later hand, writing in black ink, gives Item I the title, ‘Tractetus super canonem misse’, with ‘Thome de Stureya’ written below this in brown ink. There was originally text written in black ink at the top of folio 1r, where Item I begins, but it has since been crossed through and is now illegible. The following quire marks are visible at the bottom, centre of the beginnings of gatherings: ‘a’ at folio 1r; ‘c’ at folio 9r; ‘e’ at folio 23r; and ‘f’ at folio 31r.

On folio 25r, where damage has occurred to the manuscript, there is a mark placed next to the partly destroyed initial letter ‘S’. The mark is repeated on the top-right of the folio with a letter ‘S’ below it, indicating to the reader that the damaged letter is ‘S’.

At the top of folio 31r, the beginning of Item 2, in brown ink, a later hand wrongly attributes the following item to: ‘Gwaltirus mahap Archidiaconus Oxon.’ Items 2i-2iii are heavily glossed and emended throughout in the same later hand.

3(h). Provenance.

Very little is known about the early provenance of Digby. It would seem, from a comparison between the quiring and the contents - discussed previously, that independent works of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries were brought together in one volume. It is certain that this volume of works was together and at Christchurch, Canterbury by the early

---

97 See section on ‘Provenance’ for Thomas of Sturry.
98 The following description of known provenance draws heavily on, and summarizes, the work of Hill 1970-72, pp. 275ff and Ker 1986, pp. 115-120.
99 See also Hill 1970-72, p. 275.
fourteenth century at the latest as it is catalogued as being amongst the contents of one of Henry of Eastry’s books.\textsuperscript{100}

The first known owner of Digby was Thomas of Sturry (senior), whose name was added in brown ink to folio iv'. Sturry entered Christ Church about the middle of the thirteenth century and was the sub-prior there by 1270,\textsuperscript{101} although, it is unclear as to whether he himself collected the items contained within the manuscript or what their sources were.

It is Ker's opinion that a fragmentary version of the Early Middle English \textit{Proverbs of Alfred}, MS Cotton Galba A. XIX, once formed part of Digby.\textsuperscript{102} It would seem that the \textit{Proverbs} were the final item in Digby until at least 1622, when they appear as part of the manuscript in Twyne’s catalogue of Allen’s manuscripts.\textsuperscript{103} They are, therefore, likely to have become detached from Digby and formed part of Sir Robert Cotton’s collection at some point between the creation of Twyne’s catalogue in 1622 and Cotton’s death in 1631.\textsuperscript{104} The \textit{Proverbs} were certainly not with Digby when it arrived, bound and stamped, at the Bodleian Library in 1634. The ‘velam guilt’ catalogue, which accompanied the manuscript to the Bodleian, MS. Digby 234\textit{a}, p. 28, included the \textit{Conduct of Life}, described as ‘Rythmi quidam Anglosaxonica’, and is followed immediately by the \textit{Proverbs}, listed as ‘Alfredi Regis Parabolae Saxonice’.\textsuperscript{105} However, Gerard Langbaine, who collated the manuscript against Twyne’s own description, at the time of arrival, added ‘[Non comparent.]’ against the \textit{Proverbs}. Hill, therefore, believes that the \textit{Proverbs} probably reached Cotton about 1628 when Richard James became his librarian.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{100} Hill 1977, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{101} Hill 1970-72, p. 277.
\textsuperscript{102} Firstly in Ker 1936, pp. 115-120, and then again in Ker 1964, p. 38, fn. 6, where he states that ‘B.M., Cotton Galba A. xix and Bodleian, Digby 4 formed one volume.’
\textsuperscript{103} See Ker 1936, p. 116, fn. 4, and Hill 1970-72, p. 275.
\textsuperscript{104} Hill 1970-72, p. 275.
\textsuperscript{105} Hill 1970-72, pp. 275-276.
\textsuperscript{106} Hill 1970-72, p. 275.
Apart from this association Hill details three other connections between the *Proverbs of Alfred* and the *Conduct of Life*: Jesus includes both the *Proverbs* and the *Conduct* in the same hand; Maidstone MS. A 13 includes, on folio 93r, a shortened version of the *Proverbs* and two lines from the *Conduct of Life*; and, the *Proverbs* in the Maidstone MS and Cambridge, Trinity College MS. B.14.39 and the *Conduct of Life* in McClean are associated with a series of Old English letter forms accompanied by their names.\(^{107}\)

3(j). Binding.

The binding of Digby is seventeenth century\(^ {108}\) with two clasps attached to the upper board and two corresponding pins attached to the bottom. The manuscript is very tightly bound. The binding is stamped front and back with the arms of Sir Kenelm Digby.

3(h). Condition.

The manuscript is, on the whole, in a very good condition with very little in the way of holing, worming or tears. However, some limited holing and worming can be found at folio iii', folio 18r,\(^ {109}\) and folio 21r.\(^ {110}\) The top-left corner of folio 28r has been torn, destroying most of the first line.\(^ {111}\) The outer corners of Item I have been cut diagonally, but this is a stylistic feature rather than damage.

3(i). Shelf Marks

\(^{107}\) Hill 1970-72, p. 278.


\(^{109}\) A small hole, that does not interfere with the text, left of centre at the bottom of the folio with the reverse visible at 18v.

\(^{110}\) This is found at lines 15-17, with the scribe has written around the hole and the reverse on folio 21v.

\(^{111}\) A mark below the tear corresponds to a mark on the right of the folio where a later hand inserts the missing line by writing down the margin of the folio. On folio 28r (the reverse) the same is true with the same later hand adding the missing line to the outer margin of Line 1.
There are several shelf marks and indications of ownership on the opening folios of the manuscript. On the inside front board there is the initials and numbers ‘S.C 1605’ printed on a modern label and affixed top-left. Located centrally on the upper half of the same board and written in black ink are the initials and number: ‘K. D. 4’. Below this, written in pencil, is written ‘MS. Digby 4’. A further pressmark, ‘A.127.11’, can be found at the top/centre of folio iii’. On folio i’, in black ink, is written ‘Thom: de Sturey’, earliest known owner and sub-Prior of Christchurch toward the end of the thirteenth century, and on folio ii’, below the ‘A. 127.11’ pressmark, is written: ‘Richard Late Warr’ - partly erased but referring to Richard Lateware c 1563/4-1601, Fellow of St John’s College, Oxford.

3(j). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 1970-72; Macray 1883.

---

112 Digby 4 is item ‘II’ in Bodl. MS. Wood F. 26, Brian Twyne’s ‘Catalogus Manusciporum in Bibliotheca m’Tho: Allen Aulae Gloc: Oxon a’D.’1622’, p. 30, see also Hill 1970-72, p. 280, n. 28.

113 See section on ‘provenance’, and Hill 1970-72, p. 280, n. 29.
4. British Library MS Egerton 613

Parchment. s. xiii and four folios of fragments s. xv. Size of Leaves: 220 x 145 as cropped.

British Library MS Egerton 613 is a composite manuscript containing English, Anglo-Norman, Continental French and Latin.

4(a) Contents.\textsuperscript{114}


2. Folio 2\textsuperscript{r}/1-20, Of on \textsuperscript{hta}f is so fayr and bri\textsuperscript{ʒ}t. \textit{Of One that is so Fair and Bright} or \textit{A Song to the Virgin}. English and Latin verse written in long lines. IMEV 2645. DIMEV 4198. Ed. Brown 1932: 24-27, no. 17. Ed. Morris 1872: 194-5, no. 28; Ed. Sisam 1970: 19-21, no. 13. For Description and commentary see Hill 1978a: 397.

3. Folios 2\textsuperscript{r}/21 - 2\textsuperscript{r}/12, [I] blessed beo \textsuperscript{þ}u lauedi ful of houene. \textit{A Prayer to the Mother of Mildness} or \textit{A Prayer to the Virgin}. English Verse written as prose. IMEV 1407, DIMEV2341. Ed. Brown 1932: 111-113, no. 55. Ed. Morris 1872: 196-6, no. 29. For Description and commentary see Hill 1978a: 397-398.


\textsuperscript{114} Many of the English lyrics/verse (Items 1, 2 & 3) in this manuscript have multiple published editions. This description gives reference to some of these, but the list is not comprehensive. A fuller bibliography can be found on the DIMEV, when searched for by either the number or the first line.


14. Folios 27v/25–29v/9, Ici comencet lestoire del exaltaciun de la sai|nte cruz. EN icel tens puis que costentins veu out le signe de | la cruiz. L’Exaltation de la Sainte Croix. French prose. Folio 28 is fragmentary, leaving 14 complete lines present on the recto and 13 on the verso. The item contains 77 complete lines, although it probably had approximately 115 when written. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 400–401.


21. Folios 71-74. Twenty-three Medical Recipes. English prose with headings in a large script. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 404. Recipes are as follows:

Folio 71r. 1. [F]Orto chace out þe goute in what so euer he be. fro place to place.
2. [F]Or þe goute a medecyn.
3. [A]noþer medecyn for the same.

Folio 71v. 5. [F]or a man þat hathe pe pestilence. e|velle. þat is þe boche.
6. [F]Or þe same anoþer.
7. [F]Orto breke a boche sodenly.

Folio 72r. 8. [F]Or þe zoluwold a medecyn.
9. [F]Or þe same euelle anoþer.
10. [F]Or þe same euelle anoþer.
11. [F]Or a man þat haþe þe palesye for a mel|decyn þerfore.

Folio 72v. 12. [F]or þe same euelle anoþer.
13. [F]or þe same euelle a medecyn.

Folio 73r. 14. [F]Or scabbe on a mannes body. | ycheye sor 7 sal eþe away. a mel|decyn.
15. [F]Or ache in mannes shulderon or in his armes or in his senues.

16. [F]Or scabbe an handes þorou claw|yns in a mannes slepe. a medecyn.

Folio 73v. 17. [F]or werton [sic] on mannes handes or | scabbe.

18. [F]Or swellying of nayles.

19. [F]Or sor þies þat greuen so|r. 7 listeþe men to goun 7 to wirche.

20. [A]nd þy þyes be swollen beneþ þe | kne or to broken.

21. [F]Or kneu þat be swollon harde.

Folio 74r. 22. [F]Or þe same euelle anoþer.

23. [F]Or to don away anon þe quakyng of | þe feuer of a man or woman þer | childe.

4(b). Collation.

Folios ix + 74 + ix (there is a stiffer leaf with marble patterning, corresponding to pastedowns, on either side of the fly-leafs). I\(^6\) (folios 1-6), II\(^8\) (folios 7-14), III\(^6\) (folios 15-20), IV\(^8\) (folios 21-28), V\(^6\) (folios 29-34), VI-VIII\(^8\) (folios 35-58), IX\(^{12}\) (folios 59-70), folios 71-74 are fragments, 130 x 95, pasted on to a paper strip, s.xix, 40mm wide. All quires are arranged with like surfaces facing, with flesh outside the first sheets of all quires.
4(c). Writing Grid.

Item I has 32 lines and occupies two thirds of folio 1\textsuperscript{v}. The writing grid for 1\textsuperscript{v} is 122mm x 105mm at the longest line (Line 31). There is no visible pricking or ruling on the folio and the text slopes from top-left to bottom-right – so that the word in final position is 10mm closer to the bottom of the folio than the word which begins the final line. The remainder of folio 1\textsuperscript{v} is left blank.

Folio 2\textsuperscript{r} has a total writing grid of 178mm x 110mm and has 36 lines. 98mm of this total (20 lines) is given over to Item 2, with a one line gap before Item 3 begins. The text of Item 3, which occupies 16 lines (76mm), expands along the line, so that there is a gradual slope of the text from top-left to bottom-right, causing the grid to be 6mm larger at the outer margin than at the inner. There are no physical signs of either ruling or pricking.

Folio 2\textsuperscript{v} has the concluding 12 lines of Item 3 and the entirety of Item 4 (12 lines) and Item 5 (five lines). The total writing grid for folio 2\textsuperscript{v} is 134mm x 105mm, with 29 lines in total, leaving about a third of the page (65mm) blank. Item 4 has a slight slope up and to the right which becomes significant by the end of Item 5, which is written in the same hand. There is no evidence of pricking or ruling.

Item 6 occupies folios 3\textsuperscript{r}-6\textsuperscript{r}, with a writing grid normally 155-168mm x 80-94mm.\textsuperscript{115} Item 6 typically has 34 lines per page.\textsuperscript{116}

Items 7 and 8 occupy folio 6\textsuperscript{v}. The writing grid totals 185mm x 100mm with 41 lines per page. 20 lines belong to Item 7, which has a writing area of 110mm x 90mm, and 21 lines, 75mm x 100mm, belong to Item 8. There is no gap between the end of Item 7 and the beginning of Item 8. The text for Item 8 runs up and to the right. The text on folio 6\textsuperscript{r} is

\textsuperscript{115} Except at folio 6\textsuperscript{r} where the prose concludes and the grid is, therefore, smaller at 145mm.

\textsuperscript{116} With the exception of folio 5\textsuperscript{v} which has 33 lines and folio 6\textsuperscript{r} where there are 29 lines plus a line gap followed by a two-line colophon.
surrounded by a double lined margin, ruled in plummet and not ink, which runs around the edge of the page, but does not extend to the inner margin or gutter.

Folios 7r-12v, which houses Item 9, has a writing grid of 176-185mm x 85-105mm,\textsuperscript{117} and has between 30 and 36 lines per page.\textsuperscript{118}

Folios 13r-30r (Items 10-16) have a reasonably regular writing grid of 178-182mm x 95-102mm.\textsuperscript{119} The items written here have between 31 and 37 lines per page, with 33 being the more regular.\textsuperscript{120} The ruled grid is occasionally visible.\textsuperscript{121}

Folio 30v (Item 17) has a writing grid of 150mm x 110mm containing 19 long-lines of Anglo-Norman verse. There are two line spaces left between lines 1 and 2, and lines 2 and 3. Pricking is visible in the outer margin. The lines for Item 17 usually have a mid-line punctum (except at lines 10, 17 and 18).

Item 18 occupies folios 31r-58v and is written in double column. It has a ruled grid (visible throughout) with double bounding lines at the inner and outer margins as well as down the centre of the page, dividing the columns. The grid varies little from 170-175mm x 100-105mm, with pricking visible in the outer margin throughout the item.

The item contains 35 brown ink drawings, set within a box with double framing lines, corresponding to the text. Each of these drawings take up 8-10 lines (10 being the norm) and are contained within the relevant column.\textsuperscript{122} The number of lines per page for this item is between

\textsuperscript{117} Folio 12v is an exception to this as it contains the conclusion to the item and, therefore, the grid is only 151mm in length.
\textsuperscript{118} Folios 10r-11r have 32 lines per page; folios 7r-7v and 9v have 33 lines per page; folios 8r-8v and 12v have 35 lines per page; folio 9v has 36 lines per page and folio 12v (conclusion) has 30 lines per page.
\textsuperscript{119} With the exception of folio 13v where it is slightly wider (110mm) and folio 30v where item 16, which only has 24 lines, has the page to itself – resulting in a smaller grid with a length of 144mm.
\textsuperscript{120} Folios 14r and 29r have 31 lines per page; folios 14r, 20r, 22-23, 25r, 27r and 29r have 32 lines per page; folios 15r-15v, 16r, 18-19r, 20r, 21r, 24r, 26r, 27r have 33 lines per page; folios 16r, 17r-18r, 19r, 24r, 25r-26r have 34 lines per page; folio 21r has 35 lines per page; folio 13r has 36 lines per page; folio 13v has 37 lines per page. Folio 28 has 14 full lines and 9 fragmentary lines on the recto and 13 full lines and 9 fragmentary lines on the verso due to damage to the folio.
\textsuperscript{121} See, for example, folios 15r, 16r, 24r and 25r-26r.
\textsuperscript{122} Occasionally the frame of the illumination drops below the outer writing grid if at the conclusion of a column. See, folio 38v.
38 and 44, with 40 being the normal.\textsuperscript{123} Lines often extend into the margin or gutter and occasionally lines are written either above or below the ruled grid.

Folios 59\textsuperscript{r}- 70\textsuperscript{v} (Quire 9: Items 19 and 20) have a writing grid of 165-170mm x 120-125mm. The text is written in single column, framed by double bounding lines. For Item 19 there are 26 lines per page except at folios 60\textsuperscript{r} and 61\textsuperscript{l} where an extra line sits below the writing grid. Seven lines conclude the text on folio 64\textsuperscript{r} before the beginning of Item 20 after a one line gap filled with a red pattern acting as a division. Item 20 also has 26 lines per page until folio 65\textsuperscript{r} ff., where an extra line is added above the writing grid.

Folios 71\textsuperscript{r}-74\textsuperscript{v} are fragments, s.xix, measuring 130mm x 90mm, pasted on to a paper strip which measures 40mm wide.

4(d). Textual Presentation.

Items 1 and 2 have paragraph markings (//), in the outer margin, to indicate the beginning of each new quatrain.\textsuperscript{124} Quatrains are also indicated by string or broken lines, in the first quatrain of folio 1\textsuperscript{v}, running from the final word or punctuation to a point (o) of the inner margin. Items 3-5 have no features of presentation that need further comment.

Item 6, folios 3\textsuperscript{r}-6\textsuperscript{v}, has several spaces left for rubricated or decorated letters which were never added, including a six line space for [S] at the beginning of the item.\textsuperscript{125}

Item 9 begins on folio 7\textsuperscript{r} with an enlarged and decorated letter ‘I’ in red, which runs down the inside margin; following this illuminated letter, every second line of Item 9 (folios 7\textsuperscript{r}-12\textsuperscript{v}) begins with an enlarged and coloured letter, which alternates between being coloured red

\textsuperscript{123} Folio 31\textsuperscript{r} has 39 lines; folios 31\textsuperscript{r}-34\textsuperscript{r} have 38 lines; folios 35\textsuperscript{r}-56\textsuperscript{r} have 40 lines; folios 56\textsuperscript{l}-57\textsuperscript{l} have 48 lines; folios 57\textsuperscript{l}-58\textsuperscript{l} have 44 lines; and folio 58\textsuperscript{v} has 42 lines per page.

\textsuperscript{124} On folio 1\textsuperscript{v}, only the last two markings are clearly visible because of damage and repair to the outer margin.

\textsuperscript{125} On folio 4\textsuperscript{r}/20, spaces have been left for [A] and [M], mid-text, with guiding letters present in the margin. Similar examples can be found at folio 5\textsuperscript{r}, Lines 14, 17, and 20, and folio 5\textsuperscript{v}, Line 25.
and green.\textsuperscript{126} Throughout this item, ascenders for the letters b, d, and þ are often elaborated with flourishes.\textsuperscript{127}

Items 9-16 are written by the same hand and many of the decorative features are the same throughout these items. Item 10, folio 13\textsuperscript{r}, begins with an enlarged and decorated letter ‘C’ in red. Many of the letters that begin lines are either red or green and the occasional letter has been touched in red. On folio 13\textsuperscript{v} decorative ascenders are present on the top line. On the same folio a decoration of weaved red and green has been used to fill the remainder of Line 13.

The incipits and explicits for Items 11-14 were added in red after the main body of the text, and into spaces that were not big enough to accommodate them. They, therefore, often spill into the margins or onto several lines above and below and often run into each other.\textsuperscript{128}

Item 11 (folio 13\textsuperscript{r}) begins with an enlarged letter ‘C’ in red with green decoration. The remainder of the item has occasional letters in red and green at the beginning of sentences, with other letters in opening position touched red; these decorative letters are less frequent than in Item 10. Decorative ascenders are also present at folios 15\textsuperscript{r} (touched red), 16\textsuperscript{r} and 18\textsuperscript{v}.

Item 12 begins on folio 21\textsuperscript{r}/12 with a large (three line) letter ‘O’ in red, with a tail that is ornately decorated and runs for a further ten lines down the gutter of the folio. Another enlarged (2 lines) ‘O’ in red, and with an eight line decorative tale, begins Line 15 of 22\textsuperscript{v}.

Further, occasional, enlarged, red letters are found within the text, in initial positions. The Item

\textsuperscript{126} Guiding marks for the rubricator can be found at folios 8\textsuperscript{r}, 9\textsuperscript{r}, 9\textsuperscript{v}, 10\textsuperscript{r}, 10\textsuperscript{v}, 11\textsuperscript{v} and 12\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{127} Examples can be found on folios 7\textsuperscript{v}, 8\textsuperscript{r}, 8\textsuperscript{v}, 9\textsuperscript{r}, 9\textsuperscript{v}, 11\textsuperscript{v} and 12\textsuperscript{r}.

\textsuperscript{128} The incipit for Item 11 has been squeezed into the outer margin of folio 13\textsuperscript{r}: ‘Ici commence la \textit{reuelaciun}'. The incipit for Item 12 has been squeezed onto Line 11 and spills on to line 12 of folio 21\textsuperscript{r}: ‘Ici comencet la \textit{ueniance de mort nostre seignur}; a mark, added by the rubricator, indicates that ‘seignur’ belongs to the line above. The explicit for Item 12 and the incipit for Item 13 run into each other as the space at folio 25\textsuperscript{v}5/6 is not large enough. Two words of the incipit for Item 13 spill on to the end of Line 7 and the remainder is found in the outer margin of Line 8: ‘Ici finist la \textit{uerniance de la mort nostre seignur}', with the incipit for Item 13 beginning straight after, where it continues to be written in the margin: ‘Ici cumencet cum faitement la saintce croiz \textit{f}u troue \al mund de caluarie \p\ere heine la reine'. The incipit of Item 14 runs into the gutter of Line 24 on folio 27\textsuperscript{r}; the remainder is squeezed in, directly below it, after Line 1 of the item (Line 25 on the folio): ‘Ici comencet \textit{lestoire del exaltaciun de la sainte cruiz}'. The explicit for this item spills over into the gutter of folio 29\textsuperscript{r} on Lines 9 and 10: ‘Ici finist del \textit{exaltaciun de la sainte cruiz}'.
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concludes on folio 25r/5 with ‘Amen’, containing a stretched N. Occasional red letters can also be found, in initial positions, throughout the text of Item 13, which begins on folio 25r/8.

Item 14 begins on Line 25 with an enlarged (two lines) letter E in red, with some further letters in red and green present throughout the item. Decorated ascenders can also be seen on the top line of folio 29v. Item 15 begins on folio 29r/10 with an enlarged (two lines) ‘S’ in red. Item 16 begins folio 30r with an enlarged (two lines) letter ‘O’ in red; on the same line there are examples of decorated ascenders reaching the top of the folio.

Item 18 is missing an enlarged letter ‘Q’ at the beginning of folio 31ra - a six line space has been left. None of the rubrication has been added and there are, therefore, spaces for letters of two lines in height throughout the text, especially below the line drawings that make up this item.

The line drawings are as follows:129

Folio 31vb/21-31 1. Knight on left pierces lion (right) through neck.

Folio 33ra/20-30 2. Hunter (right) pierces antelope (Aptalops),

which has its horns caught in a tree (left),

through flank.

Folio 33vb/23-32 3. Man (left) and woman (right) standing in flames

- firestones (Dous Perres).

Folio 33vb/11-20 4. The Saw Fish (Serre), a winged beast standing

vertically on waves (left). Two men rowing in

boat (right).

---

129 This account of the line drawings in Item 18 is an adaptation of that found in F. M. McCulloch, Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries, University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, XXXIII (1962), 28-9, 59-60, 57, n.36, and verified by myself with any additional notes added.
5. Caladrius, a bird, perched by the head of a sick man in bed and looking towards him: another caladrius perched at his feet (right) looks away.

6. Pelican in piety.

7. Night Raven/Screech-owl (*Nicticorace, freseie*)

8. Eagle (*Aigle*) with fish in its beak.


10. Pair of hoopoes (*Hupe*) plucked by young.

11. Ant hill (*Formi*)

12. Siren (*Sereine*) with harp (left) next to three figures in a boat.

13. Hedgehog (*Heriçon*).


15. Fox (*Gupil*) on back feigning death: bird pecking in his mouth.


17. Beaver (*Bevre*) biting off his own glands. Hunter with horn (left) and two hounds.

18. Hyena (*Hyaine*) with right paw raised.


Folio 43vb/13-22  21. Wild Ass (*Asne salvage*).

Folio 44va/1-10  22. Ape (*Singe*) holding tool (left).

Folio 44vb/9-18  23. Heron/coot? (*Fulicià*) on floating nest. The bird is unnamed.

Folio 45rb/3-12  24. Panther (*Pantere*) amongst beasts.

24a. In the upper/outer margin of folio 45r there can also be found a winged dragon – which also corresponds to the text.

Folio 46va/23-34  25. Man in ship and another on the back of a whale (*Cetus*).


Folio 47vb/23-32  27. Three weasels (*Belette*): two of them nose to nose and Asp (*Aspis*). Man watches (left).

Folio 49ra/3-12  28. Ostrich (*Ostrice*).

Folio 49rb/33-40  29. Two turtle-doves (*Turtre*) in a tree.

Folio 50ra/9-16  30. Stag (*Cerf*).

Folio 50vb/23-31  31. Left blank at time, should have a picture of the Salamander (*Salamandre*) – writing added in a later hand.

Folio 51ra/12-20  32. Dragon watches doves (*Colom*) in Paradixion tree.
Folio 52\(^{vb}\)/33-40 33. Elephant (Olifont).
Folio 53\(^{vb}\)/33-40 34. Mandrake (Mandragoire).
Folio 54\(^{th}\)/33-40 35. Diamonds (Aimant).

The initial letter ‘D’ of Item 19 on folio 59\(^{r}\) is enlarged (3 lines), and written in red. There are two further examples of enlarged (two lines) illuminated letters later in this text: they are both ‘A’ and are found at folio 61\(^{v}\)/21 and folio 65\(^{r}\)/2. All letters in opening positions at the beginning of each line are capitalized, placed in the margin and touched in red. Items 19 and 20 are divided by a one line, red, floral decoration.

Item 20 begins on folio 64\(^{r}\) with an enlarged letter ‘I’ written in red which extends for 4 lines down and into the gutter of the folio. As in Item 19, each new line of folio 64\(^{r}\) begins with a capitalized letter in the margin which is touched in red. From folio 64\(^{v}\) onwards the opening character of every second line is placed in the margin and written in red rather than being touched red. There are several enlarged (2 lines) letters written in red present in this item,\(^{130}\) however, from folio 68\(^{r}\) onwards it is very hard to see the rubrication due to the discolouring of the parchment.

4(e). Scribes.

There are ten main hands throughout Egerton. Hand 1 (s. xiii\(^{I}\)) writes Items 19 and 20 which occupy Quire 9 (folios 59\(^{r}\)-70\(^{v}\)), and it would appear that the material contained within this quire pre-dates the remainder of the manuscript.\(^{131}\) This quire was possibly brought together with the other items in the manuscript at a date later than at the time of composition. The quire contains a copy of the Conduct of Life, of which there is already a version present in the

---

\(^{130}\) ‘I’ at folio 64\(^{r}\)/23; ‘G’ at folio 68\(^{r}\)/4; ‘A’ at folio 68\(^{r}\)/19; ‘P’ at folio 69\(^{r}\)/26; ‘M’ at folio 70\(^{r}\)/17.

\(^{131}\) Hill 1978a, p. 396.
manuscript. In this quire there are two items which occupy the entire quire and the hand, which wrote these items, does not write anything else. The discolouring of the final folios, especially folio 70r, suggests that it was, at some time, exposed or unbound.\textsuperscript{132}

Hands 2-8 write the bulk of the remainder of the manuscript and have been dated to s. iii\textsuperscript{med}.\textsuperscript{133} Hand 2 writes Item 9-16 on folios 7r-30r; hand 3 writes Item I on folio 1r; hand 4 writes Item 6 on folios 3r-6r; hand five writes Item 7 on folio 6r; hand 6 writes Items 18 on folios 31r-58r; hand 7 writes Item 2 on folio 2r. There are also three later hands: hand 8 writes Item 3 on folio 2v, and can be dated to s. xiii\textsuperscript{ex};\textsuperscript{134} hand 9 writes Items 4 and 5 on folio 2v, and Item 8 on folio 6v; and hand 10 writes Item 17 on folio 30v. Both Hands 9 and 10 can be dated to s.xiii\textsuperscript{ex}.\textsuperscript{135}

4(f). Pagination and Foliation.

The s.xix fly-leaves are not numbered. The parchment leaves of the manuscript are numbered in pencil throughout, on the top right recto of each folio, from 1-74 in modern Arabic numerals.

4(g). Contemporary and later additions.

On the inner margin of folio 1r, slightly obscured by the tight binding, a hand, dated as s.xiv,\textsuperscript{136} writes in blank ink, ‘ne mytte hit and hu let þe te ... al of blod’. This corresponds with Lines 43 and 53 of the text which were erased. On folio 31r another hand, in brown ink, adds ‘Ky’ for the first letters of the \textit{Bestiaire}, where it had initially been left out.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{132} Hill 1978a, p.397. \\
\textsuperscript{133} Hill 1978a, p. 395. \\
\textsuperscript{134} Hill 1978a, p. 396. \\
\textsuperscript{135} Hill 1978a, p.396. \\
\textsuperscript{136} Brown 1932, p. 110. 
\end{flushright}
Also contained on folio 1v is the following notation to a bailiff of a grange in a small script of s.xiii/xiv:137

In suo negocio per diem. tolle virgas. Ante festum sancti ... per i diem Exon | ... ad uendendum auenas ante festum sancti ... per i diem ... aduendum auenas in die sancti vincenti

On folios 1r, 40r and 50v there can be found, in a large script of the same hand, s.xiv1 additions to the manuscript.138 On folio 1r there are twenty lines of prose, with four or five lines left at the bottom of the page, possibly for further additions. Hill suggests that the Latin, Anglo-Norman and English additions present on this folio, and which form this Country Calendar, suggest that the scribe was trying his hand in the three different languages.139 Hill draws particular attention to the English rhyming proverb, ¶Leef hen. Whann| hue Leyth // Loth whanne hue clok sey'th and to the (South) Western form hue of the third person nominative singular feminine pronoun.140

At the bottom of folio 40r the same scribe has added, ¶Le Baucyn fet le dowere p(ur) veire | Et la Gopil trote apres // e le chace aueyre'. This couplet, written in Anglo-Norman, was probably prompted by the bestiary account on the same folio of the fox's trick of feigning death to catch birds.141 On folio 50v the same scribe writes in the ruled frame for Picture 33 of the bestiary, left blank at the time of production, directly proceeding the account of the Salamander, ' Quatuor ex purís | vitam ducunt elementis | Camalian talpa; | maris allec aeris sala | ¶ mandra;.'142 According to Hill, between the

---

137 The dating of the hand and the transcription of the text, which is much abbreviated and difficult to decipher, is taken from Hill 1978a, p. 405.
138 For the dating of this hand, see Hill 1978a, p. 405.
139 Hill includes a transcription of this addition in full in Hill 1978a, p. 405, with full commentary.
141 Hill believes that this couplet indicates direct or indirect acquaintance with the account of the rivalry between the fox and the badger in De rerum Proprietatibus, compiled about 1230 by the Franciscan Bartholomaeus Anglicus. See Hill 1978a, p. 407
142 The scribal paragraph mark preceeding 'mandra' indicates that it belongs to the line above.
eleventh and fifteenth-centuries accounts were common, with variation, of the four creatures that draw their life from the elements: the chameleon (air), the mole (earth), the herring (sea) and the salamander (fire).\textsuperscript{143}

Folio 30\textsuperscript{r} has pen-trials, numbered from 1-10 in a s.xiii\textsuperscript{ex}/xiv\textsuperscript{v} hand of faded brown ink.\textsuperscript{144}

4(h). Provenance.

On folio ii\textsuperscript{r} there are ink and pencil notes, in the hand of Sir Frederick Madden, Keeper of Manuscripts from 1837 to 1866,\textsuperscript{145} that state that Egerton was purchased at Sotherby’s in May 1836, having previously belonged to a William Bentham of Gower Street. A pencilled note, slightly cropped, on the verso of the first folio, also in the hand of Madden, gives details on the date and source of purchase. It also gives details on the poor state of repair that the manuscript was in when acquired by the British Museum.

It is very difficult to make a statement, with any certainty, regarding the history of this manuscript before this May 1836 date. The scribes of quires two to eight overlap between quires, therefore suggesting that these quires were together as part of the volume in the thirteenth century. The later additions on folios 1\textsuperscript{r}, 40\textsuperscript{r} and 50\textsuperscript{v}, in the same hand, s.xiv\textsuperscript{v}, show that by the time that the additions were made the first quire was with the second to eighth quires.\textsuperscript{146} The same hand that writes the later additions on Quire 1 is also evident in Quries 6 and 7.

Quire 9 contains one of the two versions of the \textit{Conduct of Life}; the other version begins Quire 2. According to Hill’s analysis, these items (9 and 20) ‘are independent copies of the same

\textsuperscript{143} Hill 1978a, p. 408.
\textsuperscript{144} Hill 1978a, p. 405.
\textsuperscript{145} This hand was identified by Dr. Willets, as published by Hill (Hill 1978a, p. 408).
\textsuperscript{146} Hill 1978a, p. 409.
exemplar, and both show distinctive South-western linguistic features.\textsuperscript{147} However, additional evidence based on the content and the language of the manuscript points to the (South) West Midlands rather than to the South West.\textsuperscript{148} Hill believes that the reason that both versions of the same text are included in the manuscript is to preserve Item 19, which is on the same quire and is in the same hand as the incomplete version of the \textit{Conduct} which follows it.\textsuperscript{149} Item 9, although later, is a more complete version of the text and is written in a more assured hand. Hill contends that Item 9 was copied in place of Item 20, implying that the ninth quire was also part of the thirteenth-century volume, and was therefore also brought together with the first quire by the mid-fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{150}

The contents of Egerton suggest a compiler with an interest in Anglo-Norman devotional literature with continental French affiliations.\textsuperscript{151} It is unclear, however, whether the manuscript was ever in the hands of a female religious house or a male devotional community responsible for the wellbeing of their Sisters.\textsuperscript{152}

\textbf{4(i). Binding.}

Tight; s.xix\textsuperscript{2} and s.xx\textsuperscript{10} Half-morocco.\textsuperscript{153}

The notes, in ink and pencil, on ii\textsuperscript{r} and the s.xix flyleaves, would suggest that the manuscript was rebound shortly after the British Museum acquired it for their collection.\textsuperscript{154} There are no records of binding work on manuscripts of the British Museum before the 1880s.

\textsuperscript{147} Hill 1978a, p. 409.
\textsuperscript{148} Hill points to the regional associations of the English proverb on folio 1\textsuperscript{r} and the addition on folio 50\textsuperscript{v} as further evidence of this point. She also cites the inclusion of the \textit{Bestiaire} of Guillaume le cler, who apparently lived in Coventry and Lichfield and the similarity between the content of Item 6 and contemporary devotional English prose as further evidence of a (South) West Midlands origin for the manuscript. (Hill 1978a, p. 409).
\textsuperscript{149} Hill 1978a, p. 409.
\textsuperscript{150} Hill 1978a, p. 409.
\textsuperscript{151} See Hill 1978a, p. 409.
\textsuperscript{152} Hill 1978a, p. 409.
\textsuperscript{153} Hill 1978a, p. 395.
\textsuperscript{154} Hill 1978a, p. 408.
The manuscript was partially re-covered in July, 1919, in half-morocco. It is possible to distinguish the s.xix\(^2\) binding from the later re-cover, both on the spine and at the corners.\(^{155}\)

The cover has been embossed with a coat of arms denoting the Egerton collection with the words *Sic Donec* (so far, so good) below.

### 4(j). Condition.

The amount of patching and mending strips that have been used on Egerton suggests that the manuscript was left a long time without repair.\(^ {156}\) The damage is as follows:

On the first folio the bottom outer corner has been torn away and patched with mixed parchment. The upper outer margin of folio 1 has also been patched on the verso. Folios 2-17 have been patched on their bottom-right corners. Staining on folio 2', corresponding to the section missing from folio 1 reinforces the assertion that the manuscript was a significant time without repair. The staining is substantial on the recto and verso of the first folio and the recto of the second. The damage to folios becomes less as folios 2-17 progress. Folio 14 is patched all the way down the outer margin. Folio 28 has suffered major damage with over half of the bottom section of the leaf missing entirely; a patch of 160mm x 140mm has been used to repair this folio.

There is also further minor damage throughout the remainder of the manuscript: Folio 30, has a small patch at the bottom, outer margin. The bottom corner and outer margin of folio 31 has been patched on the verso. The bottom outer corner and lower outer margin of folio 32 has been patched on the recto. Folio 48 has had its bottom, outer corner and the mid to upper, outer margin patched on its recto. The outer margins of folio 51' and folio 52' have been

\(^{155}\) Hill 1978a, p. 395.

\(^{156}\) See also Hill 1978a, p. 397.
patched. Folio 53 has been patched on the verso of its lower outer margin and folio 54 has been patched on the recto of its lower outer margin.

Further minor patching can be found on the bottom-right corner of folios 56-59 and folios 62, 64 and 67. Much of the remainder of the manuscript, up to Quire 9, has very minor, almost imperceptible patching, throughout. The final four folios of Quire 9 are stained, especially on the verso. Folios 69v and 70v are badly stained, with the text being difficult to read on folio 70v because of the discolouring.

The last six folios of Quire 9 have suffered from worming as have the first leaves of the manuscript.

4(k). Shelf Marks.

Red stamps of the Egerton collection, British Museum are present at folio 1r and at folio 74v.


Hill 1978a.

---

157 See folio 35v, folio 36r, folio 36v and folios 40-47.
5. Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II

Parchment. s.xiii°. Size of Leaves: 185 x 142 as cropped.

A tri-lingual anthology of individual texts from various sources. The codex contains a diverse range of texts written in English, ranging from secular debate to religious visions, lyrics, lives of saints and the Conduct of Life.

5(a). Contents.


[the remainder of the folio has been left blank].


6. Folio 179r/22-25, Weole þu art awaried þing, vneuene constu dele. | Þu yeuest a wrecche weole y nouh. noth þurh his hele. | Wy þ freomen þu art ferly feid. wiþ sauhte 7 make heom sele. | Þe poure i londe naueþ no lot. wiþ riche for to mele. *Curse of Wealth or Fortune.*


27. Folios 195r/5, Quando frumentum venditur pro xij. denariis. Assize of Bread. Latin. Hill 1966b, 204.


*St Paul’s Vision of Hell* or *The XI Pains of Hell*. English Verse with Anglo-Norman prologue.


Dean, no 244.


Anglo Norman verse. Dean, no 534.


5(b). Collation.


158 Affixed to the first stub is a modern bifolium measuring 9.5mm x 6.5mm. This bifolium only has writing on the first recto – giving a modern shelf mark and an indication of where ‘printed notices of this manuscript occur.’
The main body of the manuscript is divided into two unrelated parts. Part I contains a fifteenth-century chronicle of 144 folios, composed in Latin on paper. Part II has 114 parchment leaves. + 2 paper flies +2 vellum stubs. The last end stub has a gilt stamp from binder's waste, s.xvii. The preceding stub is from the same book and shows signs of folding over the spine as do the first stubs which, according to Hill, were probably used to strengthen the spine.

The quiring deviates from Gregory’s Rule, that the flesh side forms the outer leaf of a quire. The manuscript normally has the fleshside facing fleshside and hairside facing hairside. The first quire has the fleshside as the outer leaf.

5(c). Writing Grid.

The frame and the lines are ruled in dry point for 32 lines per folio The writing grid is around 140mm x 110mm when single column and 145mm x 60mm when double column. Writing is often found above the top line.

5(d). Textual Presentation.

Incipits are rubricated in the same hand as the main scribe. Initial letters are often red or blue and contained within the line or, frequently, of two lines, with tendrils and circles in red and blue. Item 4 (folios 175-178/7) is written in double column with couplet aa, in the left hand column, joined with b, in the right hand column, by rubricated braces.

---

159 Hill 2003, p. 270.
160 Hill 2003, p. 271.
161 This is discussed in more detail in Hill 2003, p. 272.
5(e). Scribes.

One hand writes throughout. This hand has been dated by Hill to c. 1285-1300.¹⁶²

5(f). Pagination and Foliation.

Part I has modern numbering from 1 to 143b (folio 143 occurs twice – now 143a and 143b) as well as the roman numbering lxix-ccxvi (numbered at time of production – at the top/centre of the recto of each folio) of the Latin chronicle. This numbering is continued in Part II to 262, in pen, although it is often crossed through. Modern Arabic numbering also begins Part II at 144 and runs to 257.

5(g). Contemporary and later additions.

The ink foliation (top right) has often been crossed through in pencil with a modern pencil foliation added from folio 144r. On folio 144r the Roman numeral ‘II’ has been added in black ink. On folio 155r, under the final line of Item 1, a cursive hand in brown ink incorrectly glosses ‘halewe. to her swete sune.’ as ‘Halleluja to her sweete son!’ The rest of the folio is filled, in the same hand as the gloss, with the lines: ‘On parte of a broaken leafe of this | MS. I found these verses written | whereby the Author may bee guest at. | (viz) | Magister Iohan eu greteþ of Guldenorddepo. | And lendeþ eu to Seggen. þat synge nul he no. | Ne on þisse wise he wille endy his song. | God Louerd of heuene. beo vs alle among. | AMEN.’¹⁶³ On folio 156r couplet 3a and 4a have been underlined in brown ink. Further glosses and underlining, in the same brown ink, can be found on folio 159r, 162r, 162v, 204r, 247r.

The words ‘senche’ and ‘wole bi-þenche’ have been added to the end of lines 29 and 30 of folio 173r in a later hand. On folio 182r, a later hand adds ‘on þe lufthonde’, after the conclusion

¹⁶² Hill 2003, p. 271.
¹⁶³ This hand and that of the gloss cited previously have been consistently attributed to The Reverend Thomas Wilkins († 1699). See Hill 1975, and Hill 2003, pp. 275-276.
of Line 8 and ‘nolde here’ after the conclusion of Line 18. Possibly the same later hand adds ‘colput dup ant gret’ to Line 15 of 184”; ‘wedes’ to Line 20 of 186”; ‘þouht’ to Line 20 of 186”; ‘scarlat non’ to the end of Line 2 of 187”; ‘Ro ne Rest’ to Line 23 of 187”; ‘þris’ to the end of Line 4 and ‘þy ros’ to the end of Line 5 of 188”; the writing of ‘ing’ is added to ‘fast’ of Lines 29 and 30 of folio 192”; ‘veylard’ is added to the margin of Line 4a of folio 245’ and the same word is added between the columns of folio 247’ (underlined in brown ink). The signature of Thomas Wilkins, in black ink, follows Item 23 on folio 192’ and ‘Tho Wilkins’ in brown ink is added with his mark at folio 257”.

5(h). Provenance.

It is unclear why the two parts of Jesus described above have been bound together. Hill conjectures that it is possible that they were brought together under the classification ‘Legal and Historical’, since ‘Part I treats of the history of the English Kings while part II includes two important legal and historical texts’: Item 26 Shires and Hundreds of England and Item 27 Assize of Bread. 164

Hill dates the compilation of Jesus to the first half of Richard Swinfield’s episcopacy at Hereford Cathedral between about 1285-1300165 based upon its localisation in the region of Ledbury, Herefordshire166 and the presence of Item 27 Assize of Bread167. The first known owner of the manuscript, with both parts likely together, is most probably Sir Thomas Ragland, the eldest son of Sir John Ragland, originally of Carnlwdd in Llanarvan,

167 The “Assize” was a secular legal statute and was the subject of a dispute before and during Swinfield’s episcopacy. See Hill, 2003, p. 273.
Glamorganshire knighted in 1513 and Lord of Redwick, Monmouthshire in 1520. The writing of 'thys ys thomas ragland/ ys boke he that ste[leth] hym salbe/ hangyd by a crowke and thomas' within a gap on folio 109. This can be dated before 1547 as the same hand writes 'god saue the kynge and the quyne and thomas'; a reference to Henry VIII (1509-47). The last private owner of the manuscript was the Reverend Thomas Wilkins (1625/6-1699), Rector of Llanvair, Llantrissant, who is the only person whose hand is present in both parts of the manuscript. Wilkins, who was a former student of Jesus College, donated the manuscript to the college between 1684 and 1689.

5(i). Binding.

Binding of Mottled Calf was executed shortly before 9 January 1693. It has a blind-tooled design, front and back, of two rectangles, formed by 3 line fillets, placed one inside the other. 3 lines extend from the inner rectangle, through the corners of the outer rectangle, to the corners of the binding. The manuscript would originally have had two fore-edge clasps, the straps now missing although the lower of the two anchor points and remnants of the original strap can be seen on the upper board and the corresponding catch plate/pin is still present on the lower board. The manuscript was re-backed s.xx. A fragment of 1693 binding/spine has been attached to the end paste-down of the manuscript.

---

171 Hill 2003, p. 270.
172 Hill 2003, p. 270.
5(j). Condition.

The leaves of the manuscript are generally in good condition. There is slight damage to the corners of folios 147 and 148. There is a small hole in the vellum (8mm x 7mm) of folio 154; the scribe writes around this hole at lines 12 and 13 of folio 154r. There are 3 small holes in folio 159; the scribe writes around these holes at lines 17 and 18 of column b. There is a hole in the outer margin of folio 167r; the ‘s’ from the final word of Line 33 is written above the hole as a result. There is some discolouring to the top of folio 173v and 174r but the text is still legible. The top right corner is missing from folio 175r. There is some tearing on folio 189. There is a hole (15mm x 15mm) at the bottom of folio 201r and some small holes caused by worming on the final line. There are some small holes on folios 156, 231 and 251 which do not interfere with the text.

5(k). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 2003.
6. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS. McClean 123

The Nuneaton Codex

Parchment. s.xiii/xiv. Size of Leaves: 262 x 172.

6(a). Contents.


---

173 See James 1912, p. 264.
4. Folios 30r/65v, Qui ben commence | e ben define | Co est uerite | sewe e fine. Guillaume le
clerc’s Bestiaire or The Bestiary of William the Norman. Anglo-Norman verse. 37 illustrations
in pencil throughout the text. For descriptions and commentary see: Langfors 1917: 312; Legge

with French verse translation. Bottom half of folios contain outline drawings, in pen and ink.
Approx 74 drawings have been cut out – 17 remain. Six leaves are missing at the beginning
(stubs visible). A description of the damage is contained later in this commentary. Folio 105 is
blank on verso. For descriptions and commentary see: James 1912: 268-9; Legge 1963: 236-9;

6. Folios 106r–107r, Five antiphons. Hours of the Virgin:
   i. Folio 106r, O beata uirgo mariaquis | tibi digne ualeat
   ii. Folios 106r-106v, Sub tuum presidium confugimus (with music on a five line stave)
   iii. Folio 106v, Admitte piisima dei genetrix (incomplete because of missing folio
        between 106v and 107r);
   iv. Folio 107r, ora pro nobis deum alleluya (begins imperfectly because of missing folio;
        with music on a five line stave);
   v. Folio 107v, Alma redemptoris (with music on a five line stave).

[ Folios 107v-108v ruled but left blank.]

by a prose account in French of the prayer’s protective virtues. See Hill 2002, p. 194.

[ Folio 109v blank]

[Folio 113⁰ blank, except for the name John Eyton and the letter k]

[Folio 114⁰ blank]

9i. Folio 114⁰, Explanation of Old English letters þorn, wen, yoʒ, and, with illustrations of their use in initial and final position:

þorn

þ  þonne þo þider þe þu haueþ naueþ teþ goþ

wen

ƿ  pinnan þepman ponie pende þele pope

yoʒ

ʒ  þef þus þer þender draʒ sclaʒ arʒ marʒ

and

7 Williame 7 Jon 7 thomas 7 symun 7 þu 7 ich.


Folio 120⁰ Erased: Salue fac serum domine etc.

---

6(b). Collation.

i + 122 + i, foliated in pencil (top right) from folio 1 on recto continuous. I^{12} (folios 1-9) wants three in 10th, 11th and 12th position, stubs visible after folio 9, II^{12} (folios 10-21), III^6 (folios 22-29), IV-VI^12 (folios 30-65), VII^6 all excised, stubs visible between folios 65r and 66r, VIII^8 (folios 66-73) quire numbered 7 in manuscript, IX^8 (folios 74-81) quire not numbered in the manuscript, X^8 (folios 82-89) quire numbered 9 in the manuscript, XI^8 (folios 90-96) wants one in first position – stub showing between 89v and 90r; quire numbered 10 in the manuscript XII^{10} (folios 97-105) wants one in 6th position, stub showing between 101v and 102r; quire numbered 11 in manuscript, XIII^4 (folios 106-108) wants one in the 2nd position, stub showing between 106v and 107r; quire numbered 12 in manuscript, XIV^{10} (folios 109-113) wants five in 6th-10th positions, stubs showing between folios 113v and 114r; quire numbered 13 in manuscript, XV^{12} (folios 114-122) wants three in 9th-11th positions, stubs showing between 121r and 122r; quire numbered 14 in manuscript.

The 122 folios are surrounded by modern flies and modern pastes. A pair of modern bifolio have been folded to form the flies and pastes at the beginning and end of the manuscript; the final paste is loose from the binding. Quires are marked in pencil – bottom right – on recto. Catch words, giving the first words of the following quire, are present in the inner margins of 21v, 41v, and 53v.

6(c). Writing Grid.

Item I (folios 1v-7v) and Item 2, with the exception of folio 1r, occupy a writing grid of 188-192mm x 140-144mm, with triple vertical bounding lines creating a double margin on either side of the folio and down the centre of the folio. The pricking for these lines is visible.
throughout this item at the top and bottom of the folios. Folio 1’ has a writing grid of 205mm x 140mm to accommodate the opening 32 lines. The frame does not have a central division as the first 16 lines, which are written in Latin and in red, are written in single column. The following 16 lines of folio 1’ are written as per the remainder of Item I but without the guidance of the interior division. The text often spills into the ruled band that signifies the conclusion of each column. Item I has 32 lines per page with the exception of folio 1’ where column a has an extra line written below the frame. Item 2 has 32 lines per page at folios 7’ and 9’ and 34 lines per page at folio 8’ and 8". On 7’/II there is a two line gap which separates Item I and 2. On folio 9’ there is a one line gap at Line 10 column b followed by four lines of s.xiv³ red text linking the manuscript to Margaret Selman, who was Lady Prioress of Nuneaton Convent between 1367 and 1386.⁷⁷⁶

Item 3 (folios 10’-27’) has a writing grid of 178-180mm x 140mm per page ruled for 31 lines in double column, except at folio 10’ where the final two ruled lines are not used. The grid is created as per Items 1 and 2. There is a gap of eight lines, possibly for a drawing, at Line 7 of folio 10’b and a gap of four lines at Line 15 on folio 16’r. Folios 28 and 29 are left blank.

Item 4 (folios 30’-65’) has a writing grid of 178-182mm x 145mm. It is, once more, written in double column, ruled with triple bounding lines at the margins and down the centre of the page. The item normally has 32 lines per page.¹⁷⁷ Gaps are left throughout the text for line drawings (typically eight lines, although occasionally seven). In some places the drawings have been added and in others the gap has been left blank. From folio 31’ onward slits are visible in the left hand gutter marking individual lines and from folio 32’ onward pricking is visible, at the top and bottom of the folios, marking the column widths for ruling.

¹⁷⁷ The exceptions are: 29 lines per page at folios 30’-30’ and folios 32’-32’; 30 lines per page at folios 31’, 33’, 36’-37’ and folio 38’; and 31 lines per page at folios 34’, 35’ and 38’.
Item 5 (folios 66'–105') originally had pen drawings over graphite on the upper half of the folios with the text below. The original miniatures occupied a frame of ca. 85 x 120, with double bounding lines that formed a small square in each corner. The writing grid, on the bottom half of both the rectos and versos of the folios, normally occupies an area of ca. 92mm x 126mm with 16 lines per page, although, more often than not, the complete grid is not used.

Item 6 (folios 106'–108') has an initial ruled (crayon) grid of 170mm x 120mm, framed with double bounding lines on either side. It is ruled horizontally, with gaps between the lines alternating between 3mm and 6mm. Item 6 contains five antiphons set out as follows:

i). The first antiphon is written in single column, in a larger script, between the 6mm gaps, therefore, leaving a 3mm gap between each line. An incipit (in red) has been squeezed in at the end of the first four lines.

ii). For the second antiphon a five line stave has been drawn in red on top of the original grid, with gaps between lines set at 3mm apart. Musical notation has been recorded between the ruled lines which make up the staves. A one line gap of 3mm has been left between each stave. Within this gap the text which corresponds to the music has been inserted. Two five line staves and two lines of text complete folio 106'.

---

178 Only 17 out of the original 91 still remain – the rest have been cut from the manuscript, sometimes causing damage to the text below.
179 With the exceptions of folio 92 where the grid is reduced to 82mm x 126mm and ruled for 15 lines per page on both the recto and verso and folio 102' where the grid is enlarged to 105mm x 126mm and there is 18 lines per page.
180 There are four lines per page at folio 87' and folio 100' (the first line is fragmentary); 5 lines per page at folios 72', 86' (the first two lines are missing), 90', 93' and 98'; six lines per page at folios 72'–73', 75' (the first two lines are missing with the sixth running over onto a seventh), 79' (the first four lines are missing), 80' (the first line is fragmentary), 81' (the first line is fragmentary), 82' (the first line is missing), 82' (the first line is missing and the second line is fragmentary), 88' and 90'; seven lines per page at folios 76', 79', 84', 87', 89', 91', 92'–92', 95' and 100' (the first line is fragmentary); eight lines per page at folios 66'–67', 68', 70', 77' (the first line is fragmentary), 78'–78', 83', 85' and 101' (the first line is fragmentary); nine lines per page at folios 71', 71' (the first line is fragmentary), 83', 84', 85', 89', 93' (the first line is fragmentary), 95', 97', 99' and 101' (the first line is missing); 10 lines per page at folios 67', 77' (the first line is missing), 80', 86' (the first two lines are missing), 88', 94' (the first line is fragmentary), 97', 98' (the first line is missing), 102' and 104'; 11 lines per page at folios 76', 76' (the first line is fragmentary); 12 lines per page at folios 68'–69', 70', 74'–75' (the first two lines are missing on 75'), 96' and 105'; 13 lines per page at folios 69' and 99' (the first line is missing); 14 lines per page at folio 74'; 15 lines per page at folios 66', 96' and 103'; 16 lines per page at folios 103' and 104'; and 18 line per page at folio 102'.
three-and-a-quarter more lines of music followed by three-and-a-quarter more lines of text, set out as previous page.

iii). The layout for the third antiphon reverts to the grid used for the first antiphon, with the text written between the 6mm gaps and a 3mm gap left between written lines. This piece is incomplete as a folio is missing between folios 106 and 107.

iv) This antiphon begins incomplete due to a missing folio. All that remains is one-and-a-half lines of music and text – ruled, as previously described for the second antiphon, on a five-line stave with a 3mm gap for the text.

v). The final antiphon continues as Item 4, with a further six lines of music and corresponding text. Folio 107v and both the recto and verso of folio 108 are blank but are ruled as described originally for this item.

Item 7 is found in its entirety on folio 109r, taking up 25 lines of the 32 line grid. The grid is ruled for a single column of writing and measures 190mm x 120mm. Double lines at the margins mark the beginning and the end of the written line. Folio 109v has been left blank and un-ruled.

Item 8 (folios 110r-113r) has a grid which measures 180mm x 130mm, ruled in crayon. Above and below this grid there is a small gap (10mm above and 25mm below) to a set of double lines which enclose the grid at top and bottom. Single lines form the exterior grid at the inner and outer margins. Two parallel lines run down the centre of the page dividing the grid into double column. Pricking for the four vertical lines can be seen at the top and bottom of the folios. The folios that contain this item are ruled for 26 lines per page. All of these 26 lines have been used except at folio 113r where the text concludes, with only 17 lines of the first column being used.
Folio 113\textsuperscript{v} has been left blank except for the pen trials of John Eyton. It would appear that five folios have been excised between folios 113 and 114. Folio 114\textsuperscript{r} has been left blank. The verso of folio 114 (Item 9i) contains a small grid at the top of the page of 54mm x 140mm with the symbols for, and a description of, the Old English characters þorn (þ), wen (ƿ), yoz (ȝ), and (ȝ).

Item 9ii (folios 115\textsuperscript{r}-120\textsuperscript{r}) is written in single column and occupies a writing grid of 190 x 145. The grid is ruled for 32 lines per page and these are all used except at folio 120\textsuperscript{r} where only 17 lines are required to conclude the item. Triple binding lines enclose the grid on both sides. Folios 120\textsuperscript{v}-121\textsuperscript{v} are left blank.

6(d). Textual Presentation.

Item I begins on folio 1\textsuperscript{r} with the first 16 lines written in red, and continues with the initial letters of each line of the remainder of folio 1\textsuperscript{r} enlarged, coloured red, and placed inside the triple vertical lines of the bounding lines.

A gap of six lines has been left at the beginning of Item 3 on folio 10\textsuperscript{f} for an enlarged letter ‘E’.\textsuperscript{181} Each new line of Item 3 begins with an enlarged letter in the margin, although these are sometimes missing. In addition, Item 3 also contains two breaks in the text which might possibly be for the addition of drawings which were never added.\textsuperscript{182}

Item 4 is written in double column with each line starting with an enlarged capital placed within the margin; on folio 53\textsuperscript{v} these capitals have been touched red. The Bestiare contains 37 line drawings, in pencil, throughout the text; each drawing normally occupies eight

\textsuperscript{181} The letter was never inserted by the rubricator, although the mark made by the scribe indicating that this addition should be made can quite clearly be seen in the gutter.

\textsuperscript{182} The first is an eight line gap after Line 6 at folio 10\textsuperscript{f}; the second is at folio 16\textsuperscript{v} where a four line gap is left after Line 14.
Some of the drawings, however, are set beside the wrong passages of text. An account of the line drawings, which includes the misplacement of the illustrations, is as follows:

1. Initial. Christ blessing beasts and birds.
2. Man with shield charged with an escarbuncle pierces the neck of a lion on R. with spear.
3. Man with sword about to slay an antelope with its horns caught in a tree.
5. The Serre, a winged beast standing vertically on waves on L. Two men rowing in boat on R.
6. Chaladrius, a bird, perched by the head of a sick man in bed and looking towards him: another chaladrius perched at his feet on R. looks away.
7. Pelican in piety.
8. Bird (ostrich) with two hoofs, between two fleurs-de-lys.
9. Eagle with fish in its beak. This and the following illustrations are out of place and do not agree with the text.
10. Phoenix among flames, looking up.
11. Hoopoe plucked by its young.

With some variation between seven and nine lines.

This account of the line drawings in Item 4 is an adaptation of that found in James 1912, pp. 267-268, verified by myself with any additional notes added.
12. An ant hill (text relates to the hoopoe).
13. Siren in water holds the stern of a boat on R. with two men in it (text relates to ants).
14. Tree (conventional), a hedgehog in the branches: another on its back below catching apples on its spines (text relates to Siren).
15. Bird (ibis) feeding in water (text relates to the hedgehog).
16. Fox on his back feigning death: bird pecking in his mouth.
17. Unicorn lays his head in a maid’s lap: hunter pierces him (text relates to the ibis).
18. Beaver biting off his glands (text relates to the fox).
19. Hyena devouring corpse in stone tomb (text relates to the unicorn).
20. Hydrus enters the mouth of a horned crocodile (text relates to the beaver).
23. Wild asses, one lying on its back bitten by another.

24. Ape with one young one in its arms and another on its back.

25. Halcyon on floating nest.

26. Panther, a crowned beast with wings and tail, in the midst of the other beasts.

27. Man in ship: another lands on the back of the whale (aspidochelone) on which poles are erected and a pot hung from them.


29. Three weasels, two of them nose to nose: a man on R. watches.

30. Ostrich looking at the Pleiades, a young one on L.

31. Four doves in a tree.

32. Stag eating snake.

33. Salamander (dragon-like) on L.: man (upper half only seen): tree on R., probably an apple tree which the beast has poisoned.
Folio 55\textsuperscript{vb}/16-23  34. Dragon watching doves in a tree (Paradision).
Folio 57\textsuperscript{vb}/2-9  35. Elephant with castle on back.
Folio 58\textsuperscript{vb}/7-14  36. Mandrakes: two human figures growing in the ground. Tree on \textit{L}.

Item 5 (folios 66\textsuperscript{r}-105\textsuperscript{v}) once contained miniatures on the recto and verso of all its folios. The remaining pictures (19) were originally in pencil with pen added over the top of some. The following is a description of the pictures of Item 5.\textsuperscript{185}

Folio 72\textsuperscript{r}  1. John on \textit{L}. beardless, with book. The second angel blows trumpet. A ship sinks into sea on \textit{R}. Cloud above.

Folio 72\textsuperscript{v}  2. The third trumpet. Star on \textit{R}. sinking into rivers (four wavy streams, horizontal, with circles at one end to represent springs).

Folio 73\textsuperscript{r}  3. The fourth trumpet. Sun and moon in cloud on \textit{R}. Fire falls on two seated figures.

Folio 73\textsuperscript{v}  4. John with staff. Eagle with scroll in cloud.

Folio 78\textsuperscript{r}  5. John with staff. The two Witnesses lie side by side, their feet towards a gate on \textit{R}. Behind

\textsuperscript{185} This account of the line drawings in Item 5 is an adaptation of that found in James 1912, p. 268, verified by myself with any additional notes added.
them a battlemented wall, over which two men
(one with a fiddle) look.

Folio 78v 6. One witness with staff lies dead. The feet of
two, ascending, in cloud above. City falls on R:
figures among the ruins.

Folio 89r 7. Angel speaks from a gateway on L. Crowned
figure in cloud with sickle; below, He reaps
with sickle.

Folio 89v 8. Angel speaks from altar on L: angel gathers
grapes with sickle: a winepress with a horned
devil on it. On R. two horses’ heads, and above,
an angel speaking from a building.

Folios 89r and v 9 and 10. Fragments remain of feet and drapery.

Folio 91r 11. John on L. with staff. Angel pours vial (bottle)
on five rivers (as in no. 2).

Folio 91r 12. John on L. Above him angel speaks out of
cloud. On R. angel speaks out of altar with
chalice upon it.

Folio 97r 13. In C. Christ in mandorla. Angel and eagle on R.
and L. at top. On L. a group of kneeling figures:
above them angel’s head speaking out of a cloud.
On R. a similar group, above them a long
trumpet proceeding out of a cloud.
Folio 97v 14. John on L. Four angels proceeding from clouds above blow trumpets.

Folio 102r 15. Christ in mandorla: three nude figures on L., two on R.


Folio 103r 17. John writes at desk on L. Christ in mandorla on R.


Folio 105r 19. John with scroll kneels to nimbed beardless figure on a seat on R.

The Latin on folio 66r (Item 5) begins with an enlarged and decorated letter E in blue with red decoration. The French translation, which follows on the same page, begins with an enlarged and decorated letter 'E' in red with blue decoration. Each of the following folios (recto and verso) have an enlarged and decorated letter of two-line height usually alternating between red and blue with the opposite colour usually being used for decoration. In most cases the enlarged letter is 'E'.

Item 6i (folio 106r) begins with an enlarged 'O' in blue with decoration in red and blue around the letter, running along the top of the writing grid and down the inner margin for half

---

186 Occasionally the same colour is used twice, as at folios 90v and 91r.
187 With the exceptions of folios 69r-70r and folio 97v where the letter is 'A'; folio 77v where it is 'S'; folio 78v where it is 'K'; and folio 105r where it is 'T'. On folios such as folio 86r it is impossible to tell what the letter might have been because the excision of the pictures on the upper half of the page has destroyed the first lines of the text and, therefore, the decorated letter. On folio 103v there is no rubricated initial and on folio 91r there is no writing at all.
a page, filling two full lines and two gap lines. An incipit (in red) has been squeezed in at the end of the first four written lines: it reads, *hic incipit officium | beate virginitis*. Items 6ii, 6iv and 6v all contain a line of music, written on a five-line stave, followed by a line of text. The five lines of the stave have been added in red after the initial grid was drawn. The notes of the music sit between the lines of the stave. The written text of Item 6ii begins with an enlarged letter ‘S’ in red and decorated in blue. Item 6iii begins with an enlarged ‘A’ in blue with decoration in both red and blue. Item 6v begins with an enlarged ‘A’ in red with blue decoration.

Item 7, on folio 109r, begins with a French preface of 3 lines in red. The preface, which was added after the main body of writing, does not fit into the gap allowed for it and, therefore, spills over on to Lines 4 and 5. The first line of the prayer begins on Line 4 where the initial letter ‘D’ of ‘Deus’ is missing. It can be presumed from its position at the beginning of the prayer, the three-line gap that is present, and the mark left in the margin for the rubricator that this letter should have been enlarged, coloured and possibly decorated.

Item 8, folios 110r–113r, begins with an enlarged letter ‘A’ in blue which sits on the second line and extends above the top line. Latin sentences are written in red throughout the text to folio 112r where Chapter 5 begins. This chapter begins on Line 22 of folio 112ra with an enlarged (two lines) letter ‘C’ written in blue. Two further enlarged letters (not coloured) can be found on folio 112v.

Item 9 (folios 115r–120r) has a clear grid with three vertical bounding lines enclosing it at either margin. Each new line of text for this item starts with a capitalized letter, touched in red, which sits inside the gap between the two inner vertical lines of the left-hand margin. Each line

---

188 An enlarged letter ‘G’ takes up two lines beginning at Line 12a, and an enlarged letter ‘I’ runs down the vertical division of the page for six lines from line 18b.
ends with a minim height punctum which sits on the inner vertical line of the right-hand margin. A two-line space has been left at the beginning of the lines from “The Wages of Sin” for the letter ‘P’ which was never added, with a mark in the gutter present for the rubricator. On Line 3, the beginning of the Conduct of Life, the letter ‘T’ is missing from the text.\textsuperscript{189}

\textbf{6(e) Scribes.}

The manuscript, apart from any later additions, is written in Gothic bookhand (textualis). Six hands, as Hill has previously demonstrated, are responsible for the manuscript.\textsuperscript{190} Hand A writes Items 1 and 9; B writes Items 3 and 4; C writes Item 2; D writes Item 7; E writes Item 8; and scribe F writes Items 5 and 6. Scribes A, B, E and F wrote ca. 1300. Scribes C and D were writing slightly later c. s.xiv\textsuperscript{in}.

The Nuneaton Codex is a manuscript made up of seven booklets written by the four main scribes: A, B, E and F, with Scribes C and D writing later; these four scribes are responsible for individual items – there are no examples of a scribe swapping over mid-item. Scribes writing contemporaneously begin and finish their work on separate gatherings. The two examples of scribes, within this manuscript, starting a text on a gathering where another scribe has already written are at quire I and quire XIV; in both these instances scribes C and D, who have been dated to a period slightly later than the original scribes, were adding to the blank folios left within the booklets.\textsuperscript{191}

\textsuperscript{189} The indented position of the touched letters on the following two lines would suggest that the letter would have run down the ruled margin for a further two lines. Further missing letters, where a mark for the rubricator is present, are: ‘P’ at folio II\textsuperscript{5}/1; ‘P’ at folio II\textsuperscript{6}/3; ‘O’ at folio II\textsuperscript{7}/21; and ‘N’ at folio II\textsuperscript{8}/15.

\textsuperscript{190} Hill 1965, p. 88.

The relationship between the items, foliation and gatherings is as follows:

Quire I\textsuperscript{12} contains the entirety of Item I (folios 1'-7') in the hand of Scribe A and the entirety of Item 2 (folios 7'-9') in the later hand of Scribe C; folio 9'' has been left blank and the three remaining folios of the gathering have been excised. Quire II\textsuperscript{12} and Quire III\textsuperscript{8} retain all of their folios and contain Item 3 (folios 10'-27') in the hand of Scribe B; two blank folios are left at folios 28-29. Quires IV-VI\textsuperscript{12} contain Item 4 (folios 30'-65') in the hand of Scribe B. Quire VII\textsuperscript{6} has been completely excised. Quires VIII-XI\textsuperscript{8} and quire XII\textsuperscript{10} contain Item 5 (folios 66'-105') in the hand of Scribe F; folio 105'' has been left blank. Quire XIII\textsuperscript{4} contains Item 6 (folios 106'-107') in its entirety with folios 107-108' ruled but left blank. Quire XIV\textsuperscript{10} contains the entirety of both Item 7 (folio 109'), in the later hand of Scribe D, and Item 8 (folios 110'-113') in the hand of Scribe E; folio 113'' has been left blank except for the name John Eyton and the last five folios of the gathering have been excised. Quire XV\textsuperscript{12} contains the entirety of Item 9ii (folios 115'-120') with Item 9i written on the verso of the first folio of the gathering (the recto is blank). The quire wants 3 in 9\textsuperscript{th} to 11\textsuperscript{th} positions (after the conclusion of the item) with the final folio (12\textsuperscript{th} position) being used as the original pastedown.

Hill suggests that ‘the booklets, as is clear from the creased condition of their end leaves, remained unbound long enough for Item 2 and 7 to be added.’\textsuperscript{192} In the case of quire I, Item 2 was added later on the blank folios to fill some space before the remainder of the folios were excised prior to binding. There does seem to be, according to Hill’s explanation, some confusion over the addition of Item 7 and the make-up of the final two gatherings. Hill states:

Item 8, originally a quire of eight, which shows the remains of the stab stitches which held together folios 110 to 113 and their conjugate stubs at head and tail, was inserted in a bifolium and the scribe wrote the symbols (Item 9a) inside its front

\textsuperscript{192} Hill 2002, p. 193.
cover before he copied his exemplar. The end parchment leaf (folio 122) was used as the end pastedown, and the three preceding blanks were excised.\textsuperscript{193}

It would seem that Hill is mistaken in this description by confusing, in part, quire XIV with quire XV. It is probable that quire XIV, which contains Item 8, was once a quire of eight. It would mean that scribe E was, in effect, writing on the first folio of the gathering rather than the second, a much more satisfactory reading, and that Scribe D wrote Item 7 on the first recto of a folded bifolium (folio 109\textsuperscript{r}) which was placed around the original quire before binding.

Further evidence, such as the pricking/stab stitches present on folios 110 to 113 but not present on folio 109, the differences in writing grid, the absence of text on the verso of folio 109, also suggests that the quire was originally a quire of eight. It also highlights further the planned nature of this volume and solidifies the idea that binding took place after the later additions of Items 2 and 7. It is probable that the excision of blank folios took place just prior to binding and it should be noted that there are other blank folios in the manuscript where this item could have been added. However, the compiler/scribe decided to add a bifolium at the beginning of this quire rather than use one of the blank folios still present or one that is now excised. The importance of the position of Item 7 in relation to the other material around it is therefore highlighted. Assuming, therefore, that a bifolium was added around the original quire of eight, and the importance of Item 7 to other items in the group, then it would be unrealistic, considering the care that has been taken to excise other blank folios in the manuscript, and even in the same quire, to believe that the compiler would insert a blank folio at the beginning of this quire: the text of Item 7 must have been present before binding. In a similar respect, it can be assumed that Item 2 was written on the folios of quire 1 before binding. The excision of the

\textsuperscript{193} Hill 2002, p.192.
folios that follow it in the manuscript would suggest that if it had not been present then the folios that it now occupies would also have been cut from the manuscript.

Hill claims, in the observations above, that the scribe wrote the symbols (Item 9a) inside the front cover of this bifolium (the one relating to Item 8) before copying his exemplar. However, the symbols relating to Item 9 are not present in this quire but in quire XV, which is a quire of 12. There is no reason to believe, although the main text does not begin until the recto of the second folio, that the outer bifolio of this gathering is a later addition to this quire. The symbols on the verso of the first gathering are in the same hand as the remainder of the quire and are, as Hill believes, a guide for scribe and reader.194

6(f). Contemporary and latter additions.

This manuscript is relatively unadorned with either contemporary or later additions. The following will be discussed in more detail in the section on 'Provenance'. On folio 1r there is written, ‘Iste liber constat Alicia sscheytton7 post eam conventu’ and a separate (later) inscription in pencil ‘gift of Mrs Lucy to John Gibson 8 Oct. 1853.’ At the end of Item 2 (folio 9th) there are four lines of text which are written in red ink and have been dated by Hill to s.xiv2.195 These lines read, ‘Iste liber constat domine margarete | sylemon 7 discipulas suas. Et | post mortem suam. Couentu de | Nuneton’ and links the manuscript to Nuneaton priory where Margaret Selman was Lady Prioress between 2 January 1367 and October 1386.196 On folio 113v there is written the sixteenth-century name ‘John Eyton Kt’.

194 Hill 2002, p. 197
195 Hill 2002, p. 200
6(g). Provenance.

The earliest known provenance of McClean is based on two *Ex Libris* inscriptions within the manuscript. The earlier of these, a colophon found separated from the main body of text by a line gap on 9th/10-13, and reproduced above in the section on ‘Contemporary and Later additions’, refers to Margaret Selman. According to James’ research, ‘Nuneaton in Warwickshire was a cell to the Abbey of Fontevraud, founded by Robert Bossu, Earl of Leicester, in Henry II’s reign.’\(^{197}\) Hill also notes that the position of the *Apocalypse*, immediately after the *Hours of the Virgin*, and written in the same hand, ‘brings to mind the ideals of the Order of Fontevraud, Anjou.’\(^{198}\)

The relationship between Mary and John is fundamental to the order which is founded upon the words that Christ spoke from the cross, commending the two to each other.\(^{199}\) The religious houses, therefore, grew out of the mother–son relationship which gave the abbess superiority over the monks. The Abbess of Fontevraud would also have been responsible for appointing heads of dependent houses – such as those founded in England during the twelfth century.\(^{200}\)

Hill makes an argument for the manuscript having once been at Amesbury and highlights the probability of a connection with a rich patron or patrons, possibly Edward I and Eleanor of Castile, whose daughter, Mary of Woodstock, was veiled there in 1285 at the age of 7.\(^{201}\) The case for the manuscript having been commissioned by a wealthy patron for use by a devout lady novice at Amesbury is strengthened by its contents. The texts suggest to Hill a


\(^{198}\) Hill 2002, p. 198.

\(^{199}\) Hill 2002, p. 197.

\(^{200}\) In her article, Hill details what little is known of the four dependant houses in England (Leighton Buzzard in Bedfordshire; Westwood, Worcestershire; Nuneaton, Warwickshire; and Amesbury, Wiltshire), Hill 2002, p. 198 ff.

A compilation that has been put together, selectively, perhaps by a cleric acting as a spiritual advisor, for a wealthy and educated lady.\textsuperscript{202}

The positioning of the texts within the manuscript, as has been demonstrated earlier, appears to be important, giving further credence to the idea of a planned volume or at least a selective compiler. The selections are, as Hill demonstrates, ‘of a moralising or meditative nature, and deal with individual spiritual welfare.’\textsuperscript{203} \textit{Chasteau d’Amour}, its title indicating its aristocratic and feudal tones,\textsuperscript{204} was written by Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln and the first lecturer to the Franciscans at Oxford, who died in 1253, and has been described by Thomson as, ‘an early allegory of the creation of the world and man, and man’s fall and redemption’.\textsuperscript{205} It contains, as one of its central themes, the courtly allegory of the body of the Blessed Virgin Mary as the Castle of Love.\textsuperscript{206} It is, therefore, an apt choice for inclusion in a manuscript which, it would seem, was put together for private, female devotion.\textsuperscript{207}

Furthermore, the \textit{Mirrour de Seint Églyse}, of which there are two partial versions in the manuscript should, according to Hill, be considered a seminal text for nuns, which sets out ‘how to live perfectly after the fashion of Hugh of St Victor’.\textsuperscript{208} Written by St Edmund of Abingdon, and also known as the \textit{Speculum Ecclesie}, the \textit{Mirrour de Seint Églyse} was hugely popular and is extant in Latin, French and English. The \textit{Mirrour} operates as a manual of didactic instruction, which reflects the systemisation of knowledge encouraged by the Fourth Lateran Council and the schools of the twelfth and thirteenth century. This idea of divisions and sub-

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{202} Hill 2002, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{203} Hill 2002, p. 195.
\textsuperscript{204} A point expounded by Dominica Legge in her discussion of the possible patronage of the original text for the noble youths of De Montfort. M. D. Legge, \textit{Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background} (Oxford, 1963), p. 223.
\textsuperscript{206} Hill 2002, p. 195.
\textsuperscript{207} The original composition of the “Chasteau” can be placed somewhere in the years between 1215 and 1230 with no real certainty. It was, however, widely disseminated during the mid thirteenth century, and, in particular, the time directly after the death of Grosseteste. It was translated from Anglo-Norman into Latin and into English. For a discussion on the dating of the “Chasteau” and for a list of manuscripts containing the work, see S. H. Thomson, pp. 152-154.
\textsuperscript{208} Hill 2002, p. 196.
divisions in a much larger schema, present in the *Mirrour*, meant that an individual could choose beneficial and valuable parts in relation to particular needs, or that a compiler could make decisions relating to inclusion based on audience or the purpose of the manuscript. The two sections present in McClean - Chapter 17 is on the contemplation of God in scripture and a section of Chapter 5 on meditation about oneself - seem wholly appropriate for someone in need of guidance entering a penitential and pious life.

The presence of the *Apocalypse* within this manuscript, with its original 91 ink over graphite line drawings, is certainly suggestive of a wealthy patron. Legge's study, in relation to this text, states that:

> At first only the very rich could afford such books, but by the fourteenth century a rather cheaper range, expensive still but not in the same class, was being produced.²⁰⁹

The popularity of the *Apocalypse* exploded during the thirteenth century partly due its references to penitence and preachers, words with particular resonance at the beginning of the thirteenth century.²¹⁰ It became a popularised text of instruction for the laity during this period and definitely would not have been out of place within a manuscript compiled for an individual entering into religious instruction. The drawings and the text which corresponded to it would most certainly have served to focus the individual on personal meditation.

Hill further establishes the probable composition/compilation of the manuscript for a female recipient by indicating that in the *Pseudo-Augustine Prayer* the feminine form *pecacatari* is used - the intention being that this item was for the use of women.²¹¹ The inclusion of the *Pseudo-Augustine Prayer* and *Hours of the Virgin* also suggests a probable link to continental France - once more strengthening an association, not only with Fontevraud, but

---

²¹¹ Hill 1972, p. 46.
also the royal family of Edward I. It should be added at this point that any link being suggested here or in Hill's study is circumstantial and is offered only as a possibility of provenance that should neither be fully adopted nor rejected. Hill states:

I can find no evidence for or against my suggestion that Ms McClean 123, which belongs to Edward I's period of patronage of Amesbury, was commissioned by a wealthy patron for the individual use of a novice at Amesbury, either a daughter of the cloister or a more recent entrant in the early fourteenth century, for indoctrination in the rigid rule of Fontevraud.212

If, for the purposes of argument, it is accepted that McClean was once present at Amesbury, then Hill believes that it may have reached Nuneaton by means of the hierarchical relationship that would have been present between the mother house at Amesbury and the sister house at Nuneaton.213

The second *ex libris*, s.xv, can be found on folio 1r and reads, ‘Iste liber constat Alicia sscheynton et post eam conventu’. There is, at present, no information upon Alice Shenton, although Hill suggests that, although the convent is not stated, she might well have taken her name from Shenton in Leicestershire, about six miles from Nuneaton.214

On folio 113r there is the sixteenth-century name ‘John Eyton Kt’ who, as yet, has not been identified. The next inscription is on folio 1r, written in pencil and reads ‘gift of Mrs Lucy to John Gibson 8 Oct. 1853.’ According to Hill's research, Mrs Lucy was Mary Elizabeth, daughter of Sir John Williams, Bart, of Bodelwyddann, Flint, who married George Lucy of Carlecote, Warwickshire, in 1823.215 The John Gibson of the inscription was the architect of Westminster who had some part in the designs for the Houses of Parliament.216 Gibson died on

---

215 For a fuller description of the Lucy ancestry see Hill 2002, pp. 89–90.
23 December 1892 and the manuscript was sold as part of his library on 9 May 1893 by Christie, Manson & Woods. In December of that year the manuscript was advertised in the sale catalogue of Bernard Quaritch, a well-known Picadilly book seller, as ‘The Nuneaton Codex’ and sold to Mr Frank McClean of Trinity College, Cambridge and Tunbridge Wells. The manuscript, along with many other valuable books and items of art, was bequeathed to the Fitzwilliam Museum after McClean’s death in November 1904.

6(h). Binding.

The original binding is contemporary with the bringing together of the manuscript at the beginning of the fourteenth century. The manuscript was sewn on five double supports with chamfered oak boards, covered with red-dyed alum tawed skin. The original oak boards were retained when the manuscript was repaired in 1893. However the original covers, which were in disrepair, were replaced and covered by red-dyed goat skin. New parchment pastedowns and flyleaves were supplied at the time of repair. The single central strap, as well as the clasps, is missing.

6(i). Condition.

The most significant damage to the manuscript is to Item 5, the Apocalypse. It would appear that six leaves are completely missing from the beginning of the item, and the item retains only 19 of the original pictures – the remainder having been excised from the

---

218 Hill 1965, p. 90.
219 Hill 2002, p. 204.
220 Hill provides a description of the binding in Hill 2002, p. 191. A special thanks must be extended to the reading room staff of the Fitzwilliam Museum who provided me with a description of the manuscript, including the binding, which is as yet unpublished.
manuscript – leaving only the bottom half of the leaf, which contains the text.\textsuperscript{221} Where drawings have been cut from the manuscript the text below is sometimes damaged.\textsuperscript{222} There is further damage at folios 28 and 29 where pieces of parchment measuring \textit{ca.} 200 x 75 have been torn from the bottom/outer corners of the folios; these folios are blank and so the text of the manuscript has not been affected. The manuscript has lost a total of twenty leaves with the seventh quire having been completely excised from the manuscript.\textsuperscript{223}

The original end paste-down is now loose from the binding and has been replaced by a modern bifolium. The original leaf is stained and holed and carries the marks on its verso of the five binding strips from the wooden board that it was once pasted onto. There is a further hole on folio 38, measuring 8mm x 12mm, and situated 3mm in from the outer edge of the folio and 26mm from the bottom. The hole would have been present at the time of production and does not interfere with the text.

\textbf{6(j). Surrogate Descriptions.}

Hill 2002; James 1912.

\textsuperscript{221}The following folios have had the top half of the page excised: folios 66-72, 74-77, 79-88, 90 (with some fragments of drawing remaining), 92-96, 98-101 and 104. The folios that have been left complete are folios 72-73, 78, 89, 91, 97, 102-103 and 105.

\textsuperscript{222}The first 4 lines of folio 69 (recto and verso) are fragmentary due to the cutting of the picture from the top half of the folio. This has led to a tear in the leaf which has been repaired, unsuccessfully, on the verso. Folio 70 is also damaged, meaning that the first two lines on both the recto and verso are fragmentary. A repair has, again, been attempted on a tear in the leaf. Folio 71 is missing its first line on recto and verso due to cutting. Folio 75 is missing the first two lines on recto and verso. Folio 77\textsuperscript{7} is missing its first line and most of the first line is missing from the verso. Folio 79 has suffered serious damage due to excision; only the last two lines of text remain on the recto and the last three on the verso. A split runs down the centre of the bottom half of the page due to the mutilation of the picture that was above. The verso of folio 80 has a first line that is only partially readable. Folio 81 has fragmentary first lines on both the recto and verso. Folio 82 is missing its first lines on both the recto and on the verso and the second line on the verso is also difficult to read because of mutilation. The first two lines are missing from both the recto and verso of folio 86. It would appear from the stub visible between folio 89 and folio90 that a folio has been completely excised from the manuscript at this point. The first line of folio 93\textsuperscript{7} is fragmentary, as are the first lines of writing on both the recto and verso of folio 94. Folios 98 and 99 have missing first lines on both their rectos and versos due to excision. Folios 100 and 101 have fragmentary first lines on their rectos and versos. A clear stub, with part of the writing grid visible on the recto as well as some of the red ink decoration of the rubricated letter, is visible between folios 101 and 102.

\textsuperscript{223}Six stubs are visible between folios 65 and 66. A further folio is missing between folios 106 and 107 affecting the end of item 6ii (incomplete) and the beginning of 6iv (incomplete).
TEXTUAL HISTORY:
The Manuscripts, Reception and Possible Audiences

The *Conduct of Life* was copied and reshaped from c.1200 to 1300, and offers evidence of how such texts underwent modification over time as audiences and cultural contexts changed. The two earliest versions of the *Conduct of Life* are extant in two homiliaries. Lambeth and Trinity share similar material and contain primarily texts in English.224 Until recently the wealth of material written in English in the period following the Conquest, to which the *Conduct of Life* and the homilies of Trinity and Lambeth contribute, has largely been characterised as belonging to a dying tradition, with scholars such as Scahill claiming that both Lambeth and Trinity:

> belong to another, dying cultural world, for in them English still has sufficient status to be the primary language of a manuscript, with some Latin and no French; and the prose homilies soon ceased to be copied.225

Scahill’s view that homiliaries, such as Lambeth and Trinity, written in English in the post-Conquest period belong to a ‘dying cultural world’ typifies a historiography of English literature in which the conquest of 1066 imposes a fundamental break, relegating vernacular literature to subaltern status; this narrative has been largely overturned by trends in literary

---

224 The Lambeth manuscript shares five Middle English homilies with the Trinity manuscript, in addition to the *Conduct of Life*, although the shared materials in both manuscripts, including the *Conduct of Life*, are not closely related, and probably go back to an older exemplar. For details see Margaret Laing, *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 38.

studies that are encouraging scholars 'to step away from enshrining 1066 as a fundamental break between pre- and post-Conquest culture'.

However, at its most extreme, some scholars tasked with writing an overview of written English after the Conquest have seen the period as no more than ‘an incoherent, intractable, impenetrable dark age scarcely redeemed by a handful of highlights.’ Others, such as Christopher Cannon, see the importance of early Middle English writings only in signposting what is to come, insisting that ‘what a particular writing should know best is that it is part of some larger “order”’. The English texts of the post-Conquest period always have, according to such academics, one eye on the later medieval period:

Until the fourteenth century, in fact, English literature has seemed an ‘unstable continuum’, a shape in which the spaces between texts are more common—and therefore seem more definitive—than writings themselves.

However, if the period is without shape for Christopher Cannon then that is because ‘shape’ for him appears to be defined by and is limited to the genre of medieval Romance or the writings of Chaucer.

What is overlooked in this approach is the materiality of the manuscript tradition, the wealth of writing in English during this period, and the interactions between the languages of England over a sustained period. Our understanding of the literature of the post-Conquest period cannot depend upon accepting the authority of a canon which relegates it to the position

---

229 Cannon, Grounds of English Literature, p. 19.
of mere prologue. Treharne’s critique of such implicit hierarchies and ‘superficially imposed divisions ... [on] English literary and linguistic development’, identifying in particular the texts of c.1060–c.1220 as poorly served by such periodisations, also notes the implicit valorisation of literary works understood as ‘original’, ‘creative’ and ‘poetic’ by the critical regimes of later centuries – regimes dictated by canons of taste and literary taxonomies that fail to comprehend the significance of much of the period’s cultural production.

Consequently, the Conduct of Life is absent from Cannon’s description of the post-Conquest period, even though the number of versions of the text available, seven in six manuscripts, suggests that the text enjoyed considerable longevity. It was a work that was copied and reshaped throughout its history. Ignoring such scribal practices of copying and adaptation (discussed in my approach to this edition, pp.277-94), and considering the composition outside of its manuscript context, will inevitably leave lacunae in any analysis of literary history. In order to stabilise this continuum it is important to consider the historical context of production under which the Conduct of Life was written and rewritten.

During the Anglo-Saxon period developed an unparalleled tradition of vernacular writing. By the time of the Norman Conquest, the written vernacular, functioning alongside Latin and occasionally entirely independently of it, was routinely used for both practical and literary purposes, and as the language of government. After the Norman Conquest of 1066, however, English as a written language of governance was suppressed and the language itself

---

231 Treharne, Living Through Conquest, pp. 2-4, p. 95.
232 See, for example, Turville-Petre, Reading Middle English, p. 6.
233 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 23.
devalued by those who now held power.\textsuperscript{234} By 1070 the issue of writs and legal documents in Old English had almost ceased.\textsuperscript{235} The Norman suppression of the English language and of English-speaking elites was likely a response to the repeated rebellions in the years following the Conquest and the process of supplanting native land titles with estates awarded to supporters of William I. Clanchy concludes that ‘Old English, which had symbolized accessibility and trustworthiness to Anglo-Saxons, may now have seemed to represent challenges to Norman authority’.\textsuperscript{236} However, whilst the ‘programmatic replacement of the native secular and religious elites’, to use Faulkner’s terms, did ‘introduce French as a prestige language and shifted patronage away from English texts to French and Latin’,\textsuperscript{237} English remained the spoken language of the vast majority of the people; it remained the language of daily transactional business, and Norman elites would have needed, to some extent, to learn it.\textsuperscript{238}

Some studies, including that of Begoña Crespo, have tended to focus on this orality of the vernacular during the period, arguing that ‘the lack of literacy and the fact of being the language of a conquered people limited English to the lower ranks of society’, and concluding that the language was ‘reduced to a conversational, everyday language that was transmitted orally’.\textsuperscript{239} Writing specifically about the twelfth century, Irvine similarly concludes that despite

\textsuperscript{234} As a counterpoint, Ian Short believes that ‘there is no direct evidence that English was in any way suppressed – this particular myth was fully articulated only in the fifteenth century’. (I. Short, \textit{Patrons and Polyglots: French Literature in Twelfth-Century England} (Woodbridge, 1991) p. 247).
\textsuperscript{235} Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record}, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{236} Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record}, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{237} Faulkner, \textit{Rewriting English Literary History 1042-1215}, p. 282; see also Short, \textit{Patrons and Polyglots}, p. 236
there being ‘at least two million speakers’ of English, ‘the range of its written survival is surprisingly narrow’.  

However, the number of extant manuscript versions of texts written in English in the period after the Conquest indicates a far more serious cultural role for the English language than this narrative of decline and suppression might suggest. Orietta Da Rold asks the ‘obvious question’ – one, however, which has been largely overlooked – of ‘what is the evidence for English manuscript production between 1100 and 1400?’ She concludes that it is ‘greater than one may anticipate’, demonstrating that there are: ‘at least 32 manuscripts from the twelfth century, 116 from the thirteenth century and 74 from the fourteenth-century’. Furthermore, rather than being ‘surprisingly narrow’ in range, ‘these manuscripts contain English texts of various kinds and forms, from secular to religious themes, from prose to poetry. They include law codes, administrative matters, science and medicine’.  

Faulkner, in his discussion of English literary history from 1042-1215, concludes from the number of texts written in English during this time that although patronage was ‘redirected’ toward productions in French (and to a lesser degree Latin), there ‘indisputably remained an audience for writing in English’. For Treharne, English emerges as a politicised language, with the production of English texts in the period following the Conquest a statement of a people ‘that cannot be silenced’. She points to an ‘authority and status’, similar to the ‘accessibility and trustworthiness’ that Clanchy believed to be a challenge to Norman

---

241 For a list and descriptions of manuscripts containing English from the period 1060-1220 an excellent place to start is ‘Portal to Manuscript Descriptions: List of Manuscripts’, in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220* (http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220).
244 Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History 1042-1215*, p. 280. Also see Faulkner’s discussion of texts written in English, including the *Poema Morale*, p. 277ff.
hegemony, demonstrated in the writings of 1020 to 1220 that has not, until recently, ‘been accorded the same endorsement in the modern era’. She concludes:

The noiselessness of the Anglo Saxon in the years after 1066 is, rather, a construct of a modern academy focusing so intensely on sources it self-validates that it obfuscates other voices that have every reason to be considered viable witnesses. For both Faulkner and Treherne, the use of English in some texts like sermons and homilies ‘was dictated by pragmatic concerns like the projected linguistic limitations of the intended audience’. However, where Treherne sees the use of English as being ‘motivated by a political desire to retain and promote native language and customs’ and maintain a sense of identity through language, Faulkner is more cautious, arguing that ‘there is no need to assume that reading English texts was a marker of English ethnic allegiance’.

If there is any solid evidence in the manuscripts known to house the Conduct of Life for the English language as a locus of political resistance – or, perhaps more accurately, political mourning – it may be that identified by Treherne in the Trinity manuscript, where the text celebrating St Andrew mobilises metaphors of a sinking ship to signify the troubled nation. It remains open to question whether the Conduct of Life itself contains any instances in which the use of English is similarly thrown into focus as a political gesture; such a use, in this text, remains a contextual rather than textual matter. However, socio-political complaint and resistance are arguably present in the sermon’s structures of analogy and metaphor; Hill notes the use of the

245 Treherne, Living Through Conquest, p. 9.
246 Treherne, Living Through Conquest, p. 93.
247 Faulkner, Rewriting English Literary History, p. 280.
248 Treherne, Living Through Conquest, p. 112, p. 123 (Treherne is specifically speaking here about the West Midlands); Faulkner, Rewriting English Literary History, p. 280.
249 Treherne, Living Through Conquest, pp. 154-5.
figures of sheriff, reeve and King as avatars of temporal power and its ability to dispossess, discipline and punish the individual subject, in the following lines:250

For ne mai hit us binime, no king ne no syrreue. (50)
Swines brade is wel swete, swo is of wilde diere;
Ac al to diere he hit abuið þe þiefð þar for his swiere. (145-6)

What is certain is that in the period after the Conquest, English continued to be copied and adapted as a medium for preaching, teaching, and chronicling, with many Old English texts, such as those of Ælfric, being adapted for a new audience.251 However, as Faulkner points out, there has been a tendency to treat, for example, twelfth-century homilies as ‘debased copies of older works rather than texts in their own right’.252 These texts have been largely overlooked as within modern scholarly hierarchies such utilitarianism has not been considered ‘literary’ enough.253 This has led scholars such as Elizabeth M. Tyler to decry ‘the study of vernacular literature’ as having been ‘more fully shaped by nineteenth-century nationalism than the study of history’.254 Lerer establishes that ‘from a codicological standpoint, this period is one of the most productive for the dissemination of Old English writing’, but rather than focusing on ‘a decline in the standards of an Anglo-Saxon practice’, he encourages scholars to appreciate these products as attempts ‘to reinvent the modes of Old English writing’.255

However, for Treharne, ‘the longevity and similarity of both the form and the content of English manuscript production from the second half of the eleventh century until the

---

252 Faulkner, Rewriting English Literary History, p. 277.
253 See Treharne, Living Through Conquest, p. 4, p. 95-97; and Faulkner, Rewriting English Literary History, p. 275.
beginning of the thirteenth’, is not evidence of a ‘lack of creativity of the manuscript compilers’, but is a product of the ‘essential functionalism and adaptability of the vernacular for a wide variety of contemporary purposes’.\textsuperscript{256} Similarly, in communicating the work of the influential project ‘English Manuscripts 1060-1220’, Da Rold and Swan evidence ‘over two hundred manuscripts in the Project’s list, and over eight hundred texts in these which have pre-Conquest English roots’; yet, rather than seeing ‘nostalgia’ or ‘antiquarianism’ as the principal motivation for what might be considered a ‘lack of originality’, their work suggests that ‘scribes and compilers, and presumably their intended readers, are not preoccupied by – and perhaps not aware of – a boundary between what we might label late Old English and early Middle English’.\textsuperscript{257}

However, as my work on language has demonstrated, the \textit{Conduct of Life} is a clear demonstration of the point at which literary and spoken languages meet, where processes of manuscript and oral transmission become interrelated in complex ways, and where the sermon form’s imperative to communicate and exhort brings local variations in speech and dialect into contention with ‘literary’ imperatives of form, formality and replicability. Where contemporary scholars have identified the use of an ‘antiquarianised’ English as an expression of monastic reaction or resistance, as a vehicle for a politics of nostalgia – or, in Faulkner’s analysis, the natural result of a ‘pure’ language being superseded by the process of hybridization and the emergence of a newly polyvocal living one – there is a sense in which a closer attention to form, purpose and the cultural contexts surrounding categories of the ‘literary’ might yield a more nuanced impression of the early Middle English literary field.

The \textit{Conduct of Life}’s variant copies demonstrate a close engagement with local dialect and

\textsuperscript{256} Treharne, \textit{Living Through Conquest}, p. 97.
speech patterns; it shows that an attention to texts written for specific kinds of performance, and to fulfil certain kinds of social purposes, might complicate historical narratives by which the Anglo-Saxon language and tradition becomes essentially moribund, an object for nostalgia rather than living application.

Both Trinity and Lambeth can be seen as examples of manuscripts which reflect very clearly an audience for liturgical texts in English; this, along with the occasions of the sermons, has suggested to Sisam that the Lambeth homilies were ‘a specimen of the sermons a parish priest gave to his congregation at the end of the twelfth century’. Items such as the Pater Noster and the expositions of the Apostles’ Creed, along with a number of other items found in both manuscripts, would certainly have made suitable preaching material. The physical dimensions of both of these homiliaries also suggest manuscripts that could be carried quite easily. In addition to this, folios 2r to 9v of Trinity, which contain the Conduct of Life, should be viewed as a self-contained unit. Judging from the markings and soiling on the first quire of the Trinity manuscript, this gathering was once folded and kept separate from the rest of the codex. It may be possible that it was carried by an individual to be copied from or read aloud from.

Neither manuscript has elaborate decoration or examples of costly production. Both manuscripts are relatively unadorned, with a utilitarian character about both that is manifest

259 See the MSS description of Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52. George Younge also believes this to be the case of MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, stating that ‘the compact size of the codex and its simple decorative scheme suggests that it was inexpensive to produce and designed to be portable’. (Younge, ‘An Old English Compiler and his Audience’), p. I. See also Treharne, who focuses on five manuscripts from the beginning to the middle of the twelfth century (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 302; London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. ix; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 303; and London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv) that have dimensions that show ‘that all of these codices were conceived of as portable’ (Elaine Treharne, ‘The Production and Script of Manuscripts Containing English Religious Texts in the First Half of the Twelfth Century’, in M. Swan and E. M. Treharne (eds.), Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, 2000), 11-40, p. 15).
261 The reasons for considering this to be a self-contained unit are expounded in the manuscript description to Trinity, pp. 14-15.
261 Treharne also notes this in her description of Trinity, stating: ‘Quire 1 was folded on the vertical down the middle. The fold is from the last folio forwards; in other words, the outermost leaf when folded would be the closing folio. It thus formed a distinct textual unit.’ Treharne 2010.
not only in the materials that they contain but also in the physical make-up and presentation of the codices. In these early manuscripts there is a balance between a clear, legible script for reading and a need to maximise the space on the page. The result of this in both cases is an uncomplicated hand, with moderate compression and limited interlinear space.

Although Bella Millett accepts Sisam’s assertion that both Lambeth and Trinity were manuscripts designed for the purpose of preaching, she rejects the argument that they are typical of parish preaching at this time. She instead argues that the material in common between the manuscripts suggests that they might be seen as early vernacular versions of *pastoralia*, or at least a development in vernacular preaching that included an attempt at the ‘sharing of good practice’ across diocesan boundaries. However, although some early use of the vernacular is acknowledged, the penitential *pastoralia* did not have much in the way of momentum before about 1260. It is a more likely premise that the Trinity and Lambeth manuscripts were witnesses to a continuation and the further development of a written tradition of vernacular composition rather than a reaction to papal developments brought about by either the Third or Fourth Lateran councils. However, what is acknowledged in Millett’s study is the limitation of the appellation ‘lay audience’ when it comes to this period. It is clearly possible to describe the *Conduct of Life*, in the context of the Trinity and Lambeth manuscripts, as a text for preaching, but who the audience for this text was, and how the text was received, remains unknown.

Younge encourages us to assess the compilation of Old English homiliaries in the period following the Conquest ‘on a case-by-case basis’, agreeing with Conti that there appears to be ‘no

---


263 From the eleventh century village priests became more common as the minster churches were supplemented and often replaced by a network of parish churches. See Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 243.

264 Details of the form and content of the *Conduct of Life* will be discussed in the sections of this introduction focused on Structure and Prosody (pp. 193-209), and Sources and Analogues (pp. 210-76).
single overarching motivation’ for their production. In a chapter of Living Through Conquest entitled ‘The Remains of Conquest’, Treharne lists the extant English manuscripts from c.1100-1220, including Lambeth and Trinity, and concludes that:

One thing seems certain: there is no single textual community for this diverse English corpus, no monolithic audience of illiterate lay people; rather, users of and audiences for the English texts copied during the twelfth century, and those copied in preceding centuries, varied according to specific historical moments, particular contexts, and multiple places.

In his assessment of the materials contained within Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, Younge demonstrates that in this manuscript ‘material is altered to suit the requirements of a linguistically and theologically unsophisticated audience’. Supporting Treharne’s arguments, he states that that the manuscript was probably intended for the use of ‘conversi, adult postulants to the monastic life from a clerical or lay background’.

In a comparison of Cotton Vespasian D. xiv with Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 303, Younge concludes that the approach to Ælfric’s homily on the Nativity of Paul is markedly different, with the compiler of Cotton Vespasian D. xiv extracting ‘only the monastic element’ where in CCC MS 303 a ‘peroration’ is inserted ‘appropriate for a general audience’. In addition, he notes that throughout Cotton Vespasian D. xiv Latin phrases are removed from the manuscript’s sources, likely because its users lacked even a rudimentary grasp of the language. In comparison, Lambeth inserts Latin sentences into the sources of the Old English homilies providing, according to Swan, ‘authoritative-sounding statements for translation into

266 Treharne, Living Through Conquest, p. 127.
English’ that advance an argument for oral delivery. Treharne notes the addition of Latin source material to the English explication also present in the homilies of Trinity, ‘presumably to add authority and weight to the text’. The vernacular writings, she concludes, are ‘validated by translation and source appearing together’. This interaction between the vernacular and Latin, and the absence of it in the case of Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, reminds us that ‘no one language could serve all the diverse purposes required because their struggle for dominance was still undecided’.

In The Grounds of English Literature, Cannon acknowledges that the project of literature is only unstable when the ‘complex, trilingual culture’ of England in this period is ignored and that this shape (this absence) is also formed out of our own conception of what constitutes both ‘history’ and ‘literature’. He essays, in the first two chapters of his book, a usable ‘theory of form’ in order to create links between what he erroneously considers to be ‘individual’ and ‘isolated’ texts, and by doing so, in his own words, ‘thickening rather than advancing the general claim that early Middle English writing is richer than we have known.’

This section began by arguing that, in the period following the Conquest, texts written in English might only be considered as individual or isolated if those writings that cannot be neatly categorised as ‘literature’ by modern scholarship are overlooked and removed from their place within literary history. In addition, it will continue by showing that to ignore the ‘complex, trilingual culture’ of England, and the English language’s influence upon that culture is to artificially create more spaces between those texts written in English.

272 Treharne, Living Through Conquest, p. 135.
274 Cannon, Grounds of English Literature, p. 13.
England was multilingual even before the conquest. Until the end of the middle ages the
narrative of medieval Britain was one of a continuous arrival of people and their languages from
the continent.\textsuperscript{275} The English were constantly decoding and translating: whether it was orally
between English and Welsh, Normans, Scots or Scandinavians, or in the written texts of Latin
and the vernaculars.\textsuperscript{276} As a result, as Faulkner puts it, ‘Post-Conquest Britain was a tri-, even
multilingual, society with a literature to match’.\textsuperscript{277} However, the reality of a polyglot medieval
England, whilst regularly recognised as being so, has not until recently received the full
scholarly attention that it deserves.\textsuperscript{278} Stein, writing in 2007, believes that this is because
scholarship has rested on nineteenth-century teleologies by which ‘all history is nothing but the
history of modernity’. Modern university faculties and departments, still in hock to the
ideologies of nationhood that structured disciplinary formation in the nineteenth century,
organise themselves around the ‘idea of national languages, national literatures, and national
history’ and, therefore, tend to construct European vernaculars as ‘linguistically homogeneous
entities’.\textsuperscript{279} Recent scholarship has made some effort towards engaging with this legacy, with Da
Rold, for example, suggesting that ‘English in this period should be considered symptomatic of a
multilingual production, rather than thought of as a marginalised output’, and arguing that
‘English texts might most usefully be studied along with Latin and French’.\textsuperscript{280} This
acknowledgement of the need to reconsider medieval linguistic contestation and pluralism has
led to edited volumes such as Elizabeth Tyler \textit{Conceptualizing Multilingualism in England, c.800-c.1250}, in which the editor’s article on polyglot royal women in the period directly before
and after the conquest states that:

\textsuperscript{275} Tyler, ‘England and Multilingualism’, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{277} Faulkner, \textit{Rewriting English Literary History}, p. 275.
\textsuperscript{278} Stein, ‘Multilingualism’, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{279} Stein, ‘Multilingualism.’ pp. 28-30.
\textsuperscript{280} Da Rold, ‘Manuscript production before Chaucer’, p. 46.
Recognition of the centrality of trilingualism to the vibrancy – intellectual, aesthetic, social and political – of the literary culture of Norman England now shapes the study of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.  

Similarly, Faulkner notes that ‘the twelfth century saw the transition from linguistic pluralism to multilingualism’ and challenges literary historians to ‘ask why some texts were written in English and not in French, Latin or any of the other languages available.’  

We have already seen in Trinity and Lambeth that Latin has been added to source material to validate and add gravitas to the English texts. In this, Treharne sees a possible awareness in the compiler of early Middle English homiliaries of ‘newer developments’ in scholasticism and an ‘increased demand’ for ‘authoritative pastoral texts.’  

In the post-Conquest period Latin occupied the highest position in the ‘hierarchy of linguistic prestige’, and remained ‘the principal language of record’ across the whole medieval millennium from 500 to 1500. The English language’s relationship with Latin is more clearly defined and possibly less complicated than its relationship with the other vernacular: the language of the conquerors.  

The composition of the Trinity and Lambeth manuscripts in English without any French is likely to be reflective of the very deliberate purpose and style of both of these homiliaries and the distinct traditions and audiences of each vernacular. To copy homilies in English during this period was a pragmatic linguistic choice to appeal to a pastoral need.  

Treharne suggests that in the twelfth century Anglo-Norman literary production closely
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282 Faulkner, Rewriting English Literary History, p. 279.  
283 Treharne, Living Through Conquest, p. 135.  
284 Faulkner, Rewriting English Literary History, p. 279.  
285 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 23.  
286 See Faulkner, Rewriting English Literary History, p. 278; and Treharne, Living Through Conquest, p. 112.
paralleled English, ‘but the two appear never to have been in direct negotiation with one another’ as the different vernacular materials never appear together in compilations. Current research suggests that English manuscript production occurred almost entirely within the monastic institutions of the pre-conquest Benedictine reform group (Worcester, Rochester, Christ Church and St Augustine’s, Canterbury, Winchester, and Peterborough) and may have been for in-house non-latinate audiences or for pastoral use of parish priests affiliated to these houses. The French texts of this time, however, ‘seem to have been written to order, many for female lay patrons, aristocratic in intended audience.’

This may not be surprising considering that there was no significant penetration of French into the indigenous population. This was not necessarily unique to England, as whilst there would have necessarily been interaction between lords and those who served them, domestically or administratively, ‘nowhere in medieval Europe did the language of the ruling class become the predominant language of all its subjects’. Consequently, Short asks how we account for the ‘disappearance of English from the linguistic map of the twelfth century’. In addressing this, firstly, it is worth cautioning against ‘being prejudiced in favour of literacy’, especially with regard to the early medieval period when even ‘the most educated people did not often write.’ Ignorance and illiteracy are not synonymous during this period and it is only in the modern period that literacy has become an ‘essential mark of civilization’ that ‘indexes an individual’s integration into society’; as Clanchy states, ‘it is language itself which

288 See for instance, Treharne, Living Through Conquest, p. 131; and Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 214. It is also worth reading Clanchy’s short section entitled ‘The Anglo Saxon Heritage of Literacy’ in the same book (pp. 30-35), for a cursory discussion of the geographical locations of writings composed in English before the Conquest as a point of comparison.
290 Short, Patrons and Polyglots, p. 247.
292 Short, Patrons and Polyglots, p. 247.
293 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, pp. 7-8.
forms mentalities, not literacy'.\footnote{See Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record}, pp. 7-9.} Secondly, as this study has demonstrated, the English population was not cut off from literate culture; with scholars such as Treharne, Younge, Da Rold, Swan, and others showing that, rather than disappearing, a rich tradition of English composition endured.

With both of these points in mind, it is important to acknowledge, as Treharne does, that:

- the majority of English books, as well as many Latin manuscripts, that survive from the end of the tenth to the end of the eleventh century belonged originally to those responsible for overseeing the provision for pastoral care; namely, the bishop or the abbot, or their own appointed delegate.\footnote{Treharne, \textit{Living Through Conquest}, p. 107.}

An audience receptive to English was the largest of all audiences in England during this period and, therefore, the importance of manuscripts written in the native language should not be devalued. Finally, centres producing texts in English also appear to have been motivated by ‘a political desire to retain and promote native language and customs, and to protect the interests of the dioceses, their churches and congregations’.\footnote{Treharne, \textit{Living Through Conquest}, p. 112.} The choice of the English language and the exclusion of French in the homilies and sermons from this period need not be conceptualised as ‘antagonistic’,\footnote{Faulkner, \textit{Rewriting English Literary History}, p. 280.} but the lack of dialogue between the vernaculars might also reflect a statement of identity.\footnote{Treharne, \textit{Living Through Conquest}, p. 123.}

The occurrence of the extant versions of the \textit{Conduct of Life} in very different manuscripts is important not only for an investigation into this text’s reception but also as a guide to the reception and changing dynamic of the written English language in this country from the end of the twelfth century. The inclusion of the verse-sermon in two homiliaries,
composed primarily in English, is significant. The copying and adaptation of the *Conduct of Life* for a very different audience by the conclusion of its known transmission, at which point it is found in McClean, reflects not only a fluid attitude of scribes and compilers of this period toward the manuscript from which they are copying, but also mirrors a changing dynamic within the vernacular languages of the country.

By the thirteenth century, a traditional descriptive hierarchy of languages in England would have situated Latin above the two vernaculars, with Anglo-Norman operating as the language of prestige above English, which was the non-literary language of the peasantry. However, as Helen Fulton indicates, recent studies suggest ‘a more complex linguistic environment’ with considerable fluidity surrounding language choice. For example, as Clanchy points out, ‘Lawman procured books in Latin, French and English to write his version of the *Brut*.’ An individual conversant in Latin, English and French, if his account is to be believed, made a choice to write in English. Stein recognises this as a ‘fissured’ polyglot world of literary language, where ‘no points of stability can be found within the fluid and shifting multilingual field’. He points to the making and remaking of *Ancrene Wisse* in English, French and Latin as an example demonstrating that none of the three main languages ‘can be definitely attached either to a place of production or to a specific use’.

Similarly, Wogan-Browne encourages us to avoid conceptualizing ‘two separate vernacular languages and traditions’, previously defined as the ‘English of England and French of England’, and dispose of ideas of a ‘monoglot entity proceeding in organic linearity through
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300 Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 206.
301 Stein, ‘*Multilingualism*’, p. 34.
By 1300, according to Clanchy, an educated layman such as Henry de Bray would have been conversant with writing in three literary languages – English, French, and Latin – and ‘did not necessarily care whether sermons, songs, and tales he heard or read were new or old’. However, whilst it is anachronistic to state that there was one identifiable language of the population, it is also wrong to assume that everyone was trilingual or even bilingual. However, as Serge Lusignan has argued, ‘We can confidently claim that nearly all authors of documents drafted in French, in England, between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries, had English as their mother tongue’. What is clear is that from the thirteenth century there was a production of manuscripts that contained diverse texts written in more than one language – and, moreover, an audience for them.

Digby is a small composite manuscript with contents that should be viewed as separate, individual booklets which were brought together by the early fourteenth century. The manuscript contains a mixture of twelfth- and thirteenth-century liturgical, theological and medical works, as well as Latin and French satirical verse. The Conduct of Life is the only English composition in the manuscript, although Ker contends that BL MS Cotton Galba A. xix, a fragmentary version of the early Middle English Proverbs of Alfred, was once present in Digby.

A later composition of the Conduct of Life in a multilingual environment is found in Jesus a tri-lingual planned anthology with a single compiler/scribe copying individual texts from various sources. This manuscript contains both the Conduct of Life and the Proverbs of Alfred in the same hand, c. 1286-1300 (the only hand which writes throughout the manuscript).
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303 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, pp. 110-11.
304 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 205.
and is probably the most well-known of the manuscripts under consideration here due to the inclusion of the secular debate poem *The Owl and the Nightingale*. The codex contains a large number of texts written in English verse. These items amount to a diverse range of works ranging from secular debate to religious visions, and lives of saints. The large number of religious lyrics present in the manuscript has led scholars such as R. H. Robbins to theorise that both Jesus and London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A.IX, which share material,\(^{306}\) were compiled by the Friars as a repository of materials for preaching in the vernacular.\(^{307}\) However, Cartlidge responds to this theory by demonstrating that the Middle English religious lyrics, which include the *Conduct of Life*, are in fact significantly outweighed, in volume, by three works ascribed to the poet Chadri, writing in Anglo-Norman.\(^{308}\) These works by Chadri are, according to Cartlidge’s analysis of their thematic content, didactic but at the same time ‘light-hearted’, frustrating any definitive identification of purpose or audience.\(^{309}\) It should be said, however, that all of the twenty-one English lyrics in the Jesus manuscript are religious, concerning themselves with the necessity of repentance and contrition in anticipation of the Apocalypse, and that the prayer which concludes *The Passion of Our Lord* suggests composition, or at least transmission, within a religious order. Hill suggests that the material within Jesus was probably ‘picked up in Religious Houses of the various Orders by one or more members of Swinfield’s [Bishop of Hereford 1283–1317] familia who accompanied him on his diocesan travels.’\(^{310}\)

\(^{310}\) Hill 2003, p. 274.
In a 2014 study, Susanna Fein demonstrates the textual contact between British Library, MS Harley 2253 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 86 and scribe 1 of the Auckinleck manuscript. The study closely considers the literary culture of the West Midlands during this period and regards Harley 2253 and Digby 86 as being part of a ‘continuum of literary book production’ that also includes Cambridge, Trinity College MS B.14.39; London, British Library, MS Cotton Caligula A.ix; and Jesus.\textsuperscript{311} This ‘continuum’ appears to have had religious houses at its foundations but was expanded over time to lay households, and produced five books that ‘hold a fascinating degree of multilingualism, self-aware yet casually displayed’.\textsuperscript{312} For instance, Da Rold notes that ‘Scribe 1 of Digby 86 is someone who not only copied texts and tinted capitals in red, but also had a clear understanding and knowledge of literature in three languages, which does not correspond, perhaps, with modern expectations of the competencies that this scribe might expect to have had’.\textsuperscript{313}

The works present in Jesus, especially when we consider the inclusion of such items as The Owl and the Nightingale (followed immediately in the manuscript by the Conduct of Life),\textsuperscript{314} are very different in aim, style and register. Although some of the contents, such as the lyrics and the Passion of Our Lord, suggest a monastic background, and so it is likely that the manuscript was produced in a religious house of some kind, there is no clear proof that they were ever compiled for use within an institutional setting.\textsuperscript{315} In fact the works are so varied that the manuscript does not fit any other specifically definable milieu. What the manuscript does

\begin{footnotes}
\item[313] Da Rold, ‘Manuscript production before Chaucer’, p. 54.
\item[314] The Owl and the Nightingale is a text that Cannon is gratefully able to disentangle from the manuscript and momentarily hold aloft, as according to him it ‘is hard not to notice how perfectly this poem anticipates Chaucer’s – even if it is impossible for Chaucer to have known it’, Cannon, The Grounds of English Literature, p. 3. It might, however, be more productive to view The Owl and Nightingale within its manuscript context and ask how it anticipates the Conduct of Life.
\item[315] Cartlidge, ‘The composition and social context of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 29 (II)’, p. 258.
\end{footnotes}
suggest, in these contexts, when compared to the only other manuscript written in one hand, Lambeth, is that not only was the scribe of Jesus, who it would seem was probably also the compiler, trilingual, but also that he felt that there was an audience for such an anthology of varied works. Cartlidge, therefore, encourages us to interpret it as ‘[an] illustration of the fluidity of the cultural and social identities in this period’.  

The placement of the Conduct of Life within what would appear to be a planned, trilingual anthology with an extensive range of material is indicative of the changes that had taken place in the period since the text’s conception. The textual links of Jesus, with not only the more obvious BL MS Cotton Caligula A.IX, but also other similarly contemporaneous manuscripts, such as Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby MS 86, or British Library, MS Harley 978, should advance the idea that there was an extensive range of multi-lingual and multi-generic manuscripts dating from this period than more recent scholarship has perhaps acknowledged.

Stein argues that a large number of manuscripts produced during the twelfth- and thirteenth-century in England ‘cross linguistic boundaries in their contents while also crossing boundaries separating literary from non-literary, sacred from secular, serious from comic, popular from learned’. These manuscripts demonstrate that ‘such distinctions as public and private, ecclesiastical, or historical and literary’ would have held less water with medieval compilers and audiences. Stein concludes that the range of a trilingual compilation such as Harley 978 is ‘quite characteristic for the period’. A manuscript such as Jesus, therefore, and the placement of the Conduct of Life within it, might be seen as being typical of a culture that had room for, and drew richness from, a latitude for ‘personal idiosyncrasy’ that was only
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319 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, p. 4. 
320 Stein, ‘Multilingualism.’, p. 31.
possible in the production and compilation of writings by hand, before the imposed regularity of the printing press, and one that was open to continental influences yet more innovative, because of its place upon the fringes.\textsuperscript{321} These manuscripts, in fact, render a cultural snapshot of England as, over the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it became an 'amalgam of Anglo-Saxon, French, and Latin culture ... a distinct entity rather than a mere accumulation of parts'.\textsuperscript{322}

The two final manuscripts suggest, through their contents, different audiences than the manuscripts discussed previously. Egerton is a composite thirteenth-century manuscript containing English and Anglo-Norman verse, Continental French verse and prose, Latin verse and a piece of macaronic prose written in Anglo-Norman with Latin quotations and English phrases. The manuscript contains two versions of the \textit{Conduct of Life} independently copied from the same exemplar. Included in this manuscript, alongside the \textit{Conduct of Life}, are items suitable for the private devotion of an individual in a priory or religious house, such as the French prose apocrypha, the \textit{Gospel of Nicodemus} and the \textit{Invention of the Cross}, as well as the widely disseminated metrical \textit{Bestiaire} composed by Guillaume le clerc.

McClean is also a manuscript where the contents suggest that it was compiled for an audience devoted to individual religious contemplation. It shares with Egerton both the \textit{Bestiaire} and the \textit{Conduct of Life} and similarly has a mixture of Latin prose, English verse, Anglo-Norman verse and prose, and Continental French verse. This manuscript, as is also suggested by the contents of Egerton, seems to have been selectively put together to aid an individual’s spiritual welfare. For example, the \textit{Mirrour de Seint Églyse}, originally addressed to a single male religious, became an exemplary text for nuns, a manual for conduct and a text for

\textsuperscript{321} Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record}, p. 5, p. 16, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{322} Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to written Record}. p. 5.
didactic instruction after the example of Hugh of St. Victor. Similarly, the *Seven Prayers of the Pater Noster*, which focuses on the contemplation of God in scripture, concentrates in the second part on meditation leading to a knowledge of God.

McClean also contains Guillaume le clerc’s *Bestiaire* and a version of the *Apocalypse*, written in Latin verse with a French verse translation. The inclusion of both of these illuminated texts, and the meditative nature of the other material in the manuscript, has brought Hill to the conclusion that the manuscript was probably compiled on the instruction of a wealthy patron, probably for a devout lady novice. Most significantly, the case for this being a selective compilation for private devotion is advanced by the earlier of the two *ex libris* inscriptions, of the mid-fourteenth century, which reads, ‘Iste liber constat margarete sylemon et dicipulas suas. Et post mortem suam Couentu de Nuneton’ and firmly places the manuscript at Nuneaton Convent between the years of 1367–86 when Margaret Selman was Lady Prioress.

Both McClean and Egerton are primarily written in French with some Latin and limited English. Although The *Conduct of Life* is the only piece of English writing present in McClean its presence in a trilingual manuscript for a known audience is significant. The inclusion of English in a manuscript belonging to someone of obvious wealth and standing represents a transformation from the *Conduct of Life*’s manuscript contexts in the Lambeth and Trinity homiliaries.

This shift could be seen as a response to a perceived need to produce more texts in English for the promotion of devotional education. However, the audiences of both Egerton and
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324 The text of the *Bestiaire* in both manuscripts is accompanied by line drawings, a description of which can be found in the description of the manuscript (pp. 79–85), and which demonstrates the increased resources and emphasis on the aesthetic that these later manuscripts have in comparison to the earlier codices which contain the *Conduct of Life*.
326 This is expounded in more detail within the manuscript description p.91
McClean were certainly not lay audiences and the texts were created for private meditation rather than public performance.\textsuperscript{327} It is also evident that the production of the manuscript has changed: the two scribes, changing over mid-line in the Trinity homilies, have been succeeded by planned volumes involving multiple scribes with, in the case of McClean, individual scribes writing on separate gatherings: the act of compilation was shared and is indicative of the social status of the manuscripts - missing from both Lambeth and Trinity. The physical size of the manuscripts that house the \textit{Conduct of Life} has increased, with a sometimes lavish extravagance epitomized by the pen over graphite half-page drawings in McClean.\textsuperscript{328} They are both more highly decorated, featuring scripts that are less compressed and page layouts that are less concerned with the maximisation of space.\textsuperscript{329} The decorative presentation, undertaken perhaps as an act of contemplation, and certainly as a display of wealth, is favoured over the utilitarian functionality of the two earliest manuscripts.\textsuperscript{330}

Both of these manuscripts (Egerton and McClean) are predominantly in the French language, but the presence of the English poems within manuscripts that are directed towards individuals - and, in the case of McClean, towards devout women, of substance and wealth - in itself indicates a shift in the cultural currency of the languages.

\textsuperscript{327} For practices of private contemplation using texts, either through silent reading or vocal recitation, see Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record}, pp. 195-197.

\textsuperscript{328} Item 5 in McClean, the \textit{Apocalypse}, in Latin with a French translation, on folios 66\textsuperscript{r}-105\textsuperscript{v}, once contained miniatures on the recto and verso of all its folios. The remaining 19 pictures, the rest have been cut from the manuscript, sometimes causing damage to the text below, were originally in pencil with pen added over the top of some. A fuller description of these can be found on pp. 83-5.

\textsuperscript{329} For example, the bottom half of the folios which contain the written parts of the \textit{Apocalypse} are usually ruled for between 15-18 lines per page and yet more often than not the complete grid is not used. In fact, in a few cases as few as 4 or 5 lines are utilised – the usual being 7 or 8.

\textsuperscript{330} For the reading strategies involved in the contemplation of images within manuscripts see Clanchy, \textit{From Memory to Written Record}, p. 196
The Language of the *Conduct of Life*

A discussion of what I believe to be the key orthographical and phonological features of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* is given below and is followed by a summary table of all the features found in each of the texts. This discursive section is keyed to the summary table and to the section entitled 'Notes on Phonology and Dialects', found in the Appendix.

The Old English orthographical features are more regularly found in E2 than any other text, and less regularly in J, a text that might be considered linguistically more modern. The *Conduct of life*, therefore, might offer an interesting example of diachronic change, as well as diatopic variation, in a text of more than one version. Some examples that might evidence this:

1) The runic letter \(<\) is found in initial position (§ 2) throughout all of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* (eg. T: \(\text{fan } \Omega1\)). However, the OE usage of \(<\> initially (§ 3) is regularly found in E2 (eg. \(\text{f} \Omega30\)), alongside \(><\), and less regularly in E1 (\(\text{fan } \Omega72\)). The graphs \(<\> and \(<\> are found in both medial and final position (sometimes written as \(<d\> (§ 7) medially and finally, \(<e\> (§ 8) finally, and \(<t\> (§ 6) finally) in most of the texts (§ 4) except for the two later ones: J, where \(<\> is not present at all, and M, where \(<\> only
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331 This is a feature regularly acknowledged by other scholars, most notably Betty Hill, [Hill 1950, pp. 354-5.](#)


333 There are also rare occurrences of this, once only, in all of the other versions, except for J where the graph \(<\> does not occur at all (T: \(\text{fr } \Omega223\); L: \(\text{fr } \Omega70\); and written as \(<d\> in M and D: \(\text{darf } \Omega44\)).

334 The writing of \(<d\> for \(<\> is rare in TLDm and E2, but is a frequent occurrence in E1 (eg. \(\text{mys } \Omega13\), \(\text{bi hoted } \Omega39\) etc.); it does not occur at all in J. In D and E1 \(<d\> is written for \(<p:\)/\(<\> in final position on two occasions in each (D: \(\text{支配 } \Omega5\) and \(\text{push } \Omega49\); E1: \(\text{finch } \Omega5\) and \(\text{hath } \Omega150\)). The writing of \(<t\> for \(<\> cannot be found in TDM; it is rare in L (eg. \(\text{finch } \Omega10\), occasional in E2 (eg. \(\text{sendet } \Omega47\), but frequent in E1 (\(\text{finch } \Omega10\) and \(\text{det } \Omega21\) and \(\text{det } \Omega54\) etc.). Of these occurrences, there are only three places where the writing of \(<t\> is an example of dental assimilation brought about by the previous word. These are: \(\text{atere } \Omega152\); \(\text{mid te } \Omega366\); and \(\text{te } \Omega62\) (the only place in the text of J where \(<t\> is written for \(<\>). In the other examples it is likely that the scribe is spelling the dental fricative with a dental stop in low-stress, final position.

---
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occurs three times,\(^{335}\) and only in final position (M: \(p|le\)
\(\Omega35\); \(pen|e\)
\(\Omega42\); \(hab|be\)
\(\Omega184\)).\(^{336}\) The writing of \(<th>\) (§ 5) is rare in all of the texts.\(^{337}\)

2) The letter \(<p>\) (§ 11) is retained, as the more regular form, in all texts except for J where
\(<w>\) is normal and \(<p>\) is found just once in \(por|e\)
\(\Omega151\);\(^ {338}\) the later stage development of
writing \(<w>\) is rare in the remaining texts, and does not occur at all in E2.\(^ {339}\)

3) \(Tironian\ et\), written \(<t>\) (§ 13), is found in all texts; however, the writing of \(and\ for <t>\) is
found more regularly in J, where in the earlier texts its use is rare.\(^ {340}\)

4) The Old English ligature \(<\alpha>\) (§ 12) is regularly found in E2, alongside the newer spellings,
with occasional examples in E1, and rare occurrences in T;\(^ {341}\) \(<\alpha>\) is not present in LDJM.

5) Both E1 and E2 have examples of the Old English prefix \(ge\) (§ 57): E1 \(ge\ lade\)
\(\Omega5\); \(ge\) spinch \(\Omega37\) and \(ge\) spinch \(\Omega203\), and \(ge\) lome \(\Omega48\); E2 \(ge\) lome \(\Omega48\) and \(ge\)-sceafte \(\Omega86\). This is
found alongside irregular use of \(i\) and \(y\) found in both Egerton texts and in the remaining
manuscript versions.

6) Examples of OE \(cw\) (§ 20) are also found in E2: \(c|pan\) (\(\Omega98\)), \(c|p|med\) (\(\Omega181\)), and \(c|pen\ch\)
(\(\Omega261\) and \(\Omega262\)); in all other instances from E2, and most instances in the remaining
manuscript versions, \(qu\) has been written.\(^ {342}\)

7) The retention of \(<\alpha>\) for OE velar \(c\) might also give an indicator of diachronic change:

\(^{335}\) With the exception of \(<\alpha>\) for \(<\alpha>\) in \(dar\)
\(\Omega44\) (see previous fn).

\(^{336}\) T, L, E2 mostly have \(\Omega\) medially and finally, with some occurrences of \(\Delta\); D has both \(\Omega\) and \(\Delta\) medially but always writes
\(\Omega\) finally; E1 more often has \(\Delta\) medially but mostly has \(<\alpha>\) in final position.

\(^{337}\) It is found in all texts in \(sathan\) (\(\Omega298\)), where it is probably as a result of Latin \(satan\) but also OE \(sathan\). It is found on three
other occasions in T: \(thurh\)
\(\Omega42\), \(loth\)
\(\Omega62\) and \(meth\)
\(\Omega379\); twice in L: \(pith\)
\(\Omega227\) and \(lathed\)
\(\Omega133\), in the latter it represents \(\omega\)
(from OE \(lætan\) rather than OE \(lad\)); once in J: for medial \(\omega\) in \(ewet\); and once in M: \(rep\)
\(\Omega10\).

\(^{338}\) J also has capital \(<\nu>\) for \(<\nu>\) in \(V\) on three occasions (\(\Omega170\), \(\Omega330\) and \(\Omega340\)).

\(^{339}\) It is found most frequently in D (15 examples, eg. \(wit\)
\(\Omega2\), \(hwle\)
\(\Omega41\), \(iwise\)
\(\Omega41\) etc.) and T (11 examples, eg. \(mowe\)
\(\Omega30\), \(owen\)
\(\Omega31\), \(w|f\)
\(\Omega32\) etc.); it is found in three places in M (\(yswich\)
\(\Omega37\), \(we\)
\(\Omega170\) and \(wo\)
\(\Omega360\)); once in L (\(swc\)) (\(\Omega108\)); and once in E1 (\(wilde\)
\(\Omega152\)).

\(^{340}\) J writes \(and\)\(^ {122}\) times and \(tironian\ et\) \(68\); there are only two examples of \(and\) in T, four in L, eight in E2, sixteen in E1 and only
one in M; D has no examples of \(and\).

\(^{341}\) There are fifty examples of \(<\alpha>\) in E2; ten in E1 (nine of these occur in the first 35 lines); and six in T.

\(^{342}\) The exceptions are \(ikuen|de\)
\(\Omega284\) and \(kuen|che\)
\(\Omega261\) in D; \(ocquerne\)
\(\Omega379\) in E1; \(acquerne\)
\(\Omega379\) in J; and \(okerne\)
\(\Omega379\) in M.
Before front vowels (§ 16) all of the texts furnish us with examples of a transition to <k> in instances such as *king* (T: Ω51) from OE *cyning*. However, elsewhere in the *conduct* of Life, both E texts write *cuдеж/cuʃe* (Ω102) and *cudde* (Ω200) from OE *cyfan* (Ω102), *cunne* (Ω318 and Ω352) from OE *cyνn*, and *cunne(s)* (Ω213 and Ω376) from OE *cyνn*. However, although the writing of <c> initially and before a front vowel is more regularly found in E1 and E2, it is also present, although much more rare, in all of the remaining manuscripts, except D, where <k> is always written. See, T: *cudжен* (Ω102); J: *cuʃe* (Ω102) and *cudde* (Ω200); M: *cuʃe*(Ω102); L: *cudde*(Ω200) and *cunne* (Ω213).

In medial position in T, the oldest known text of the *Conduct of Life*, there are still some examples of the retention of <c> (§ 22) in, for example, *mislicaʒ* (Ω13), *bispicaʒ* (Ω14), and *quica* (Ω199).³⁴³ Further examples can be seen in: L *swicen* (Ω108) and E2 *licede* (Ω13). TE2E1M also share the reading *breced/brecʃ* (the only reading with <c> in E1 and M). However, in most instances the transition to <k> (§ 21) has been completed; the text of J, for example, has no instances of <c>, and always writes <k>, eg. *mýs-ʃykeʃ* (Ω13), *bi-swikeʃ* (Ω14), *quýke* (Ω80 and Ω199) etc.

Before the consonant *n* the movement to <k> (§ 18) is found in all texts except for the oldest text T, and the more conservative E2 and E1: T *cnopeʒ* (Ω115) and (Ω142), and *icnopen* (Ω170) and (Ω399); E2: *cnapeʒ* (Ω115), *icnapeʒ* (Ω142), and *icnap* (Ω170); E1 *cnaped* (Ω115), *icnoped* (Ω142: probable mistake for *icnoped*), *icnap* (Ω170), and *icnapen* (Ω399).

The retention of <c> in final position (§ 23) was retained later in the Middle English Period than <c> in other positions. As a result, the writing of <k> in final position (§ 24) is

³⁴³ It is more usual for <c> to be written in T if the vowel that follows is <a> and not <e>, the transition to <k> is more likely in medial position before *e* where the vowel is not accented (atomic), eg. *spoked* (Ω9), *likede* (Ω13), *siker* (Ω40, Ω42 and Ω43) etc.
only found in the two later texts: M has two examples of <k> in final position in *uolk* (Ω224) and *pork* (Ω267), where it is <o> at all other times; and J always writes <k> for OE c, eg. *werk* (Ω121 and Ω186), *ponk* (Ω72, Ω92, Ω115, etc.), *lok* (Ω74) etc., except for *bec* (Ω401).\(^{344}\)

8) OE palatal c /tʃ/ (§ 28-§ 31) is mostly written <ch>, but there are some possible examples of /tʃ/ with <c> found in some of the texts, with it more often present in E2: *ic* (more regular reading, with occasional *ich*), *elc* (Ω116 and Ω120, also *elch, ech, eche, æche*), *eure-elc* (Ω66 and Ω122), *spile* (Ω81, also *spilche*), *hpilc* (Ω143) and *sellic* (Ω190); and E1: *ic* (usual form, with some *ich*), *elc* (Ω116 and Ω120, also *elch, ech, elche, æche*), *eure ilc* (Ω66 and Ω122), *æc/elc* (Ω167, Ω315 and Ω317); *spile* (Ω81\(^{342}\) and Ω123), *spulc* (Ω125) and *pilc* (Ω143). In the remaining manuscripts there are further examples in T: *ic* (twice Ω12 and Ω236, mostly *ich*), *afric* (Ω33, also *africh*) and *ispinç* (Ω37 and Ω331, also *ispinch*); L: *ispinc* (Ω37, Ω58 and Ω203), *hpice* (Ω143) and *sullic* (Ω190); D: *ic* (regular reading in D with some *ich*), *philc* (Ω137), *smac* (Ω292), *ispinc* (Ω203, also *ispinch*) and *lichamlice* (Ω415).\(^{345}\) In the two later texts, J and M, OE palatal c /tʃ/ is never written as <c>.

9) OE sc (§ 35-§ 39), which becomes /ʃ/ by a process of monophonemization, is retained as the only form found in E2, eg. *scel* (Ω317), *scule(n)* (Ω54, Ω94, Ω98\(^{342}\) etc), *scolde* (Ω38 and Ω277), *fisces* (Ω85) etc. It is also the dominant form in E1, M and L, with the exception in E1 of *sæl* (Ω27), *sulle* (Ω94), *sulde* (Ω38), *solen* (Ω48) and *fisses* (Ω85); in M of *schat* (Ω380) and *fish* (Ω85); and in L of *solde* (Ω51), *sunien* (Ω161), *sal* (Ω180), *schal* (Ω122) and

---

\(^{344}\) There are examples in both L and J of <k> [x] being written for OE velar c in the c.<i> ah</i> feature associated with the OE Anglian dialect (L: Ω17, Ω124 and Ω125; J: Ω43, Ω59 and Ω125); a further example of this in L might be evidenced in the writing <ch> in *ach* (Ω59 and Ω175). There are also limited examples of <k> written for velar c in TLE2E1: T *spichen* (Ω108); L *perche* (Ω267), *perch* (Ω115); E2 *perche* (Ω111), *mis liche* (Ω115), *spunche* (Ω267 and Ω332), *spichle* (Ω264), *ech lech* (Ω33 and Ω28) and *Spunche* (Ω332); E1 *perche* (Ω111); it is not clear from these examples whether the sound is /k/ or /tʃ/.

\(^{345}\) In the above examples it is probable that *smac* is a variant in /k/, conceivable that *ispinc* is a variant in /ʃ/, and possible that *afric, sullic, elc/elc, spile, spulc, hpilce/pilc, sellic* have /k/. I am thankful to the help of Dr Richard Dance for his help on this.
fisses (Ω85). Both T and D have <s> as the dominant reading, with the exception in T of screenche (Ω348), scat (Ω380) and fisses (Ω85); and in D of scal (Ω27), iscop (Ω86), scete (Ω380), scrud (Ω380), schame (Ω174) and shilde (Ω314). Finally, in J the dominant reading is the more 'modern' <sch>, with the exceptions scolden (Ω280) and fysses (Ω85).

10) The text of E2 retains <s> in medial position after a tonic vowel and after l and r (§ 43), for example folgep (Ω14), mage (Ω30),[^346] iborege (Ω174) etc., where J shows the fricative /ɣ/ labialized and vocalized to /ɣw/>/w/ <w> in folwepe (Ω14), mowe (Ω30), lowen (Ω168) etc, with no instances of /ȝ/ written. This transition, according to Jordan, began c. 1200 in the South West Midlands, spreading later to the North Midlands and the North and was only found in writings of Kent around c. 1400.[^347] It is not surprising, therefore, that, L, an early text, and D, a text with other prominent Kentish features, also show no examples of <w>, although in L <ie> is written in fulie (Ω14) and <h> in ahen (Ω170).[^348] It is more surprising, however, that M, a later text, also retains <s> and does not write <w>. The text of T mostly retains <s> but demonstrates an early movement to <w> in the writing of mowe (Ω30), owen (Ω31) and drawen (Ω48 and Ω50). Also of significance is that E1, which would have been copied from the same exemplar as E2, shows a movement to <w> in approximately half of the examples, suggesting that either the scribe of E1 'modernised' the text as he copied, or that the scribe of E2 deliberately archaicised his version of the text.

[^346]: At line Ω194 E2 also has moghe, where <gh> would still be velar.
[^347]: Jordan §186.
[^348]: The writing of <h> likely represents /ɣ/ and is a feature of the AB dialect.
11) All of the texts except for J retain <ȝ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45), except in T before /u/ in jung (Ω4)349 and the writing in L of <g> in Giue.350 J has later <ȳ> in all instances, for example, ȝ'ong (Ω4), ȝ'et (Ω5), ȝ'euennesse (Ω313) etc.

OE palatal ȝ /j/ before i (§ 45) is mostly retained in the texts of the Conduct of Life for the writing of ModE 'if'/OE gif/gyf,351 with the exception of D where it is not present at all (for example, ef in Ω126x2, Ω173, Ω225 etc); J where it is usually omitted but is ȝ' in ȝ'ef (Ω126, Ω334, and Ω348); and examples in L and E1 where <g> is written in Gif (L Ω173; E1 Ω334 and Ω345).352

In examples of OE ȝ following a front vowel but before a back vowel (§ 47), where in OE it would have been velar, the weakening of the end syllable to e /ə/ has likely resulted in a transition to a palatal, with evidence found of <i/ȳ> written in texts other than J, where <ȳ> is always written, and in E2, where it is never found: eien (T Ω76), peien (L Ω64), variants of forpreien (T Ω100) found in all texts except for E2,353 iseien (T Ω101 and Ω102), niseien (T Ω105), ne-i-seien (E1 Ω105).

12) E2 retains the OE writing <hl> (§ 53) in hlauord (Ω81), hlauerd (Ω196) and hlusten (Ω237), where all of the other texts write <l> only, except for T hlesten (Ω237), hleste (Ω400) and D hlesten (Ω237).354

The writing of OE hw (§ 54) varies in the versions of the Conduct of Life but the <hw/hp> writing remains dominant in all texts except for M, with the exceptions being the

---

349 This was common in the OE period where the palatal approximant <ȝ> is often replaced by <i> before /u/.
350 It is possible that this is the plosive /g/, influenced by the ON cognate with /g/, however, its position at the beginning of the line and resulting capitalization, alongside the utilization of <g> /j/ for all other occurrences, suggests that this might reflect a feature of scribal practice rather than an indication of phonology and might, therefore, be read as /j/. In many twelfth-century manuscripts there is no separate capital yogh, with scribes using <G> instead.
351 The loss of ȝ before / became more common in the fourteenth century.
352 The writing of <g> here is probably also for /j/, and likely reflects scribal practice.
353 This is an important example as it is in rhyming position and a reading shared by all texts except for E2, the most conservative text. In the following line all of the texts apart from T and J write variants of iseigen/isege; this suggests that a transition to a palatal had already taken place even if it was not represented orthographically in examples such as the one found in L where forpreien is rhymed with iseigen.
354 There are no examples of <hr> written in any version of the Conduct of Life.
writing of <ph> in T *phile* (Ω314); <wh> in J *whon* (Ω213); <ph> in E2 *phet* (Ω92), *phem* (Ω136 and Ω249), *philce* (Ω137) and *phan* (Ω341); the frequent writing of <w> on its own in L *penne* (Ω36, Ω132 and Ω159), *pet/pat* (Ω80, Ω96 and Ω142), *u+per* (Ω90) and *pa-se* (Ω119); and <w> on its own in D *pile* (Ω22, Ω24, Ω28 etc) and *pat* (Ω155). In M the dominant reading is <ph> with <hu> written twice in *huat* (Ω96) and *huiche* (Ω143).

In medial position *h* in the combination <ht> (§ 55) is the regular reading in all texts except for M where <ht> is written exclusively: M *azte* (Ω2), *miȝte* (Ω16), *ezte* (Ω42 and Ω56) etc. T writes <ht> exclusively, E2 has the exception *of-دتfe* (Ω286) and J *nought* (Ω189 and Ω336). There is some variation in the remaining texts with L regularly writing <cht>, for example, *michte* (Ω19), *echte* (Ω43 and Ω56), *brichte* (Ω76) etc; E1 omits <h> in *nout* (Ω49, Ω199, Ω302 etc), *nopit* (Ω176), *vn-bout* (Ω60), *ritȝifnesse* (Ω73), writes <tt> in *britte* (Ω76), *dritte* (Ω115) and *ut-broutte* (Ω192), writes <ht> in *drithte* (Ω124), *lithte* (Ω77) and *mithten* (Ω251), and writes <ct> in *eicte* (Ω43); D writes <ght> in *ogthe* (Ω2), *(h)ȝghte* (Ω43, Ω56), *eȝhte* (Ω282), <ch> in *tichede* (Ω283), < iht> in *tadhte* (Ω283), < iht> in *eȝte* (Ω332) and *bikȝte* (Ω333) etc. and <hȝ/hȝp> in *isihȝe* (Ω297) and *isihþe* (Ω382).

13) TLE2EI retain the writing of <f> in initial position, where D demonstrates transition to voicing by frequently writing <v/u> when followed by a voiced element (§ 58): D *vele* (Ω9 and Ω10), *volȝeȝ* (Ω14), *uorȝete* (Ω35). Both of the later texts, J and M also have examples of <u/v> initially: J *veole* (Ω9), *vor* (Ω33, Ω35, Ω39 etc), *virst* (Ω38) etc; M *vele* (Ω9), *uorȝete* (Ω35), *uremde* (Ω35) etc.

355 In the writing of *nought* in J it might be possible to see a later stage development.
356 <gt> in *bikȝte* (Ω333) comes from Old Northern French *cachier* which eventually replaced OE *læccan*, ME *larcan*. Hence the past tense is *cahte, cauhte, cauȝte, caught*, like *lahte, lauhte, laȝte, laught* (OED).
357 This is from OE *siȝhþ* where <ht> and <gt> in the other texts reflect a movement to <t>.
358 The transition to voicing is a feature regularly associated with the dialect of Kent.
However, in medial position and between two voiced elements all texts demonstrate, with regular frequency, voicing [v] through the writing of <u/v>, for example E2 heuene (Ω28), leoure (Ω30), alie (Ω33); however, this is not always consistently applied, especially in the earlier texts, see E2 alife (Ω24).

In final position <f> is always written in all texts for [f], for example, D lif (Ω5), of (Ω21\textsuperscript{2}), pif (Ω32) etc. In medial position and before the dental d it has been lost in all texts other than L where hefde(n) (Ω16, Ω52 and Ω144) can be found.

TRINITY

The Language of the Conduct of Life in T is generally accepted as being of Essex, although Samuels and Betty Hill suggest a London provenance, possibly ‘influenced by immigration, perhaps from East Anglia’.\textsuperscript{359} Laing (LAEME) places the text in west Essex.\textsuperscript{360} The evidence below certainly supports localization to the South East Midlands.

Key features of T:

The rounding of OE ā (§ 69ff ) to <o>, present throughout T (eg. lore Ω1, one Ω88, non Ω115 etc),\textsuperscript{361} suggests a probable southern or midland form;\textsuperscript{362} as does the writing of <og > (moge Ω194 and ogen Ω113, Ω118, Ω121 etc) and <ow> (mowe Ω30 and owen Ω31) for OE ā + /ŋ/ (§ 137), and <ow> (eg. cnopeΩ115, blopeΩ143, sople Ω143 etc) for OE ā + w (§ 138).\textsuperscript{363} The

\textsuperscript{361} With the exception of aquerne Ω379, bihat Ω381, hatere Ω260 and hat Ω319 (bihat and hat are both contracted forms).
\textsuperscript{362} See § 69; Jordan § 44 and Mossé § 27.
\textsuperscript{363} Jordan §113 and §105. OE ā + /ŋ/ and OE ā + w joined the neutralizing to /ɔ:/ and gave /ɔː/ in most Southumbrian dialects at this time. The possible exceptions were northern parts of the Midlands and parts of the West, including the AB dialect. See also § Jordan 44 and Mossé § 27.
writing of wur < weor (purðe Ω149 and purðen Ω346) is another indicator of a southern or midland provenance.\textsuperscript{364}

The writing of Old English a before a nasal (§ 60) as a (eg. man Ω21\textsuperscript{2}, ānc Ω72, ānne Ω41 etc) suggests a probable localisation other than the West Midlands, where the back sound /ɔ/, written <o>, characteristic of the Anglian dialect in the OE period, was retained (with the inclusion of Worcester).\textsuperscript{365} Before a lengthening group (§ 61), however, T also writes <o> (eg. longe Ω3, pronge Ω170, honden Ω83 etc),\textsuperscript{366} another feature found in the writing of the West Midlands; although here it is likely that <o> in T is not a WML dialectal feature but was arrived at by way of a, which, before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands, participated in the change from a > o /ɔ/ (§ 69ff), as described previously.\textsuperscript{367}

In addition to the above, OE ea (§ 63) mostly shows retraction to a (eg. habbe Ω3, after Ω29, patere Ω84 etc), a process that took place from around 1100 in areas other than the WML and Kent;\textsuperscript{368} with OE e + j/j/ (§ 122), mostly written ai (eg. mai Ω17, maig Ω90, dai Ω383 daie Ω82 etc).\textsuperscript{369} Similarly, monophthongization and retraction to a is also found for OE ea (§ 86, §87 and §88) before r, without lengthening, where it is always a (eg. argæ Ω20, parf Ω44, arme Ω238 etc.) and before rd and rn, where it is mostly a (harde Ω166, hardne Ω178, hardde Ω178 and parnin Ω237 and Ω239 and parnie Ω315).\textsuperscript{370} In the same way, OE ea before l,

\textsuperscript{364} For the wur group, see § 97, Campbell § 320, and Jordan §66, remark 3.
\textsuperscript{365} Jordan § 30 and Moseley § 25.
\textsuperscript{366} The writing of hangæ Ω323 likely reflects a borrowing from the North that prevailed during this period. Jordan § 31 and Moseley § 25.
\textsuperscript{367} Jordan § 30 and Moseley § 25.
\textsuperscript{368} The exceptions in T are sar Ω405 and hæger Ω249. Examples of a, and the Norman writing <o> were also often found during the twelfth century, see § 63, Jordan § 30 and Moseley § 25.
\textsuperscript{369} Jordan § 32 and Moseley § 24.
\textsuperscript{370} The change of a to a gave rise to the diphthong /ə/, later /a/ (especially in final position), except in the WM and Kent, where the movement from a to a was not immediate and a writings are prominent with the later change of /ei/ > ai. (Jordan § 93). The exception in T is in the writing of seid Ω117, Ο119 and Ο140.
\textsuperscript{371} Where OE a, from Prim. Gmc. æ (Campbell § 131, Campbell for 1 of § 139, Campbell § 144), was broken to ea before r followed by a consonant, and was not already changed in OE by smoothing, it was simplified to æ around 1000 and then followed the transition to a (cf. § 68). During the eleventh century occasional eleventh century <a> writings were found alongside traditional
without lengthening (§ 90), and OE ea after sc (§ 111 and § 112), are always ⟨a⟩ (e.g. al Ω52, falle Ω327, pallen Ω42 etc and sal Ω317, samie Ω172, safte Ω86 etc), likely by the same process of monophthongization and retraction shown previously; however, since the undiphthongized Anglian form is also ⟨a⟩, these final two examples tell us little dialectally.\textsuperscript{371} However, OE ea before the combination ld (§ 91), which is mostly written ⟨ea⟩ (e.g. pealde Ω2, eald Ω4, fealde Ω55 etc) and once ⟨e⟩ (bihelden Ω405), demonstrates a southern form (excluding Kent), retained into the fifteenth century in East Saxon (including Essex and London).\textsuperscript{372} A further example of a possible Southern form (OE Saxon) in T can be found in the writing of ⟨ei⟩ (heie Ω363, Ω295, Ω171 and iseih Ω274) for OE ea before ⟨h⟩ combinations (§ 93).\textsuperscript{373}

In addition to the probable Southern forms highlighted above, there are several possible EML dialectal features: OE eo before ⟨r⟩-combinations (§ 96ff) is mostly written with ‘unrounded’ ⟨e⟩ (e.g. perke Ω11, perkes Ω64 and herte Ω75), a process begun in the EML and Kent in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{374} In addition, OE eo from back mutation (§ 102, § 103 and § 104) is nearly always written as ⟨é⟩ (e.g. a uumlaut of e: fele Ω9, brekeθ Ω93, pele Ω162 etc; u uumlaut of e: heuene Ω28, heueriche Ω43, pereldeis Ω330 etc).\textsuperscript{375} Consistent with OE ëo, the long diphthong ëo (§ 108) gives /ø/, which is retained for longer in the WML and parts of the South but is unrounded to /e:/ in the EML and the

\textsuperscript{371} The twelfth-century text of T demonstrates the writing of both ⟨e⟩ and ⟨æ⟩ in the writing of (midden)erad Ω202 and (midden)erad Ω145 and Ω207. The only other exception to the writing of ⟨æ⟩ in T is the writing of ⟨e⟩ in erasing (Ω65).\textsuperscript{372} OE ea by breaking before ⟨l⟩ was found only in the Saxon and Kentish dialects; the Anglian dialect preserved ⟨a⟩ (Campbell § 143). However, unbroken Anglian ⟨a⟩ moved southwards into the living speech of Worcester and Gloucester during the OE period (Jordan § 61). OE ea after ⟨sc⟩ was ‘smoothed’ in some areas to ⟨e⟩ or ⟨æ⟩, however, many Sax. dialects retained ea and æa. (Jordan § 75). However, as Jordan argues, [‘]if one seeks to recognize OE diphthongizing in the reflection of ME dialects, one can no longer determine them on account of the ME falling together of ea and æa, as well as ea [ææa] and æ (Jordan § 75). It is however possible to make some statement on dialect through the ’smoothed’ forms e or æ, which are present in some Saxon dialects but not in the text of T.\textsuperscript{373} Jordan § 61. The two exceptions in T are ⟨æ⟩ in holda Ω56 and ⟨e⟩ in halt (contracted form) Ω323 and Ω325.\textsuperscript{374} Sax. ⟨e⟩ is present in a limited area in the twelfth century and then more generally from the thirteenth century, followed by the front glide ⟨i⟩ ⟨ei⟩ (Jordan § 63).\textsuperscript{375} This alone cannot be seen as a dialectal marker. Although the sound ⟨i⟩ was represented by the writing ⟨ei⟩ and Anglo-French ⟨à⟩ in the WML and parts of the South until around 1300, in the North ‘unrounding’ to ⟨æ⟩ also took place, and smoothed forms of the Anglian dialect had e from OE (Jordan § 65). For OE breaking to ⟨æ⟩ from ⟨e⟩ see Campbell § 146 and § 147.\textsuperscript{376} The velar umlaut eo as a product of following back vowels was more likely in the Anglian and Kentish dialects. The EML dialect typically does not show this development, and where it might have taken place the sound was unrounded to ⟨e⟩ in eME. A similar unrounding was also found in the North. Jordan § 71 and 73. See also the dialect map in Jordan, p. 97. The only exceptions to ⟨æ⟩ in T are suster Ω157 and Ω194, and pude Ω300, written under the influence of ⟨w⟩ for the influence of ⟨w⟩ see Wright § 52.
North, and is regularly written in T with expected <e> (eg. be Ω2, lef Ω30, frend Ω31 etc); however, just as regularly, T also writes <ie> (eg. bien Ω402, lief Ω210, friend Ω231 etc), a form associated in ME with the dialect of Kent. This writing in T, with consideration of all other geographical indicators, might suggest a SEML form exhibiting some Kentish features.

The most conclusive evidence however for a SEML localisation, and possibly that of Essex or London, comes from the regular writing in T of <a> for OE æ1 and æ2. The writing of <a> for æ1 (eg. dade Ω3, rade Ω4, ofdrade Ω166 etc) on its own might suggest only a Saxon or EML form, as shortened æ also yields a in the theses regions; however, both æ1 and æ2 became ā in a limited area of the SEML near London (including Essex), with this sound also found in London by the beginning of the thirteenth century. Therefore, although the examples of <a> writing for æ1 might be as a result of either shortened æ or of æ1 > ā, the writing of <a> for æ2 (eg. mast Ω7, are Ω129, unhalæΩ17 etc), where in other regions the sound was narrowed to /ε:/ and /e:/, gives strong evidence for the provenance proposed above.

LAMBETH

It is generally agreed that this text has a WML dialect with some features of the ‘AB’ language, which are evident in the analysis that follows, with Samuels localizing it to the border of North Herefordshire and Shropshire and Laing (LAEME), due to the close affinities in language it

376 Jordan § 84.
377 It is posited in Jordan that ‘Frequent <ie> writings for eo in East Saxon Gospels, VV [Virtues and Vices] and TH [Trinity College Homilies] probably rest only on geographical influence of Kent’ (Jordan § 85, Remark 1).
378 See § 70-73; Campbell §§128 and §197; Jordan § 49-50; and Mossé § 28.
379 The exceptions being: <æ> in late Ω357, <æ> in iselθΩ16, unsele Ω208, misede Ω216 and mere Ω406. For OE þere see § 77ff.
380 The exceptions being: <æ> in axes Ω192, <æ> in hease Ω307, and rare examples of <e> in mene Ω177 and hete Ω206. For æc, etc and ylc see § 81ff.
has with that of the Worcester Tremulous Scribe and the other elements in common with the “AB” language, placing it in North West Worcestershire.  

Key features of L:

The text of L exhibits several Anglian dialectal forms: OE eo before l-combinations (§ 98) is written <o> (e.g. solf Ω14 and solue Ω26 etc: Anglian /sølf/ ) one of many dialectal features L shares with J.  

In addition, OE ie after g (§ 116) and OE ie after g (§ 117) are always written <e> (e.g. forgeteΩ39, gėfe Ω46, gėlde Ω46 etc and gėt Ω5 ), a form found in both the Anglian and Kentish dialects.  

Another feature that might indicate the influence of the Anglian dialect on the text of L is the vocalization of OE ʒ/j/ to/i/ (§ 49) before d in the pa. form of the OE verb secgan (seide Ω136, iseid Ω148, seiden Ω234), a feature once again shared with J, where ʒ/j/ was lost before d with the lengthening of the previous vowel in the writings of the West Saxon dialect, and probably also that of Kent, during the OE period.

L, however, has many forms associated with the WM, which often overlap with forms found in the South and SW: the writing of <e> (especially in perke/perch/perc Ω11, Ω113, Ω121 etc and perkes Ω64, Ω73, Ω116 etc) for OE eo before r-combinations (§ 96) suggests a smoothed Anglian form; however, the writing of <o> in horte Ω118 preserves the /ø/ sound found for longer in the WML and parts of the South. Similarly, OE eo resulting from the u umlaut of e (§ 102 and § 104) and the a umlaut of e (§ 102 and § 103) is regularly written as <o> (e.g. houene Ω28, porld Ω162, pordes Ω282 etc and folė Ω9, brokeΩ93 and unfrome Ω237), where eo by back mutation

---


383 For the breaking of e to eo before l-combinations see Campbell § 146; for ME Angl. /sølf/ (written <seolf, solf>), see Jordan § 68.

384 OE e became ie (later i, y) after palatal c, g, and sc in WS, but remained e in Anglian and Kent. See, Wright § 91. Anglian ĝēt, without dipthongization, from OE ā exhibits the same development as ā.

385 Jordan § 192. The exception in L being sede Ω164.

386 Jordan (§ 65 Remark 1) states that ‘PM MSS Egerton 613 f.7 and Lambeth 487 still permit differentiation between Sax. work /work/ < weorc and Angl. smoothed werk’.

387 L also writes herte Ω75.
then follows the course described previously for eo by breaking.\textsuperscript{388} OE ēo (§ 108) corresponds to short ēo with the long diphthong giving the long /œː/ sound, which gives longer resistance to unrounding in some areas of the WML and parts of the South than ēo, but is unrounded to /e:/ elsewhere from the twelfth century. In L, therefore, both <eo> (beo Ω30, seon Ω19, freond Ω231 etc) and <eo> (bon Ω2, son Ω167, freond Ω230 etc) are written.\textsuperscript{389} Similarly, the i-umlaut of ēo (§ 109) is nearly always written <o> (eg. freond Ω192, døre Ω153, node Ω274 etc).\textsuperscript{390}

OE ēo + w (§ 139) is written <o> in L (ropen Ω22 and sopen Ω23), a form associated with the dialects of the West and the SW, with the i-umlaut also written with <o> (untropnesse Ω279).\textsuperscript{391} Similarly, the velar umlaut io of i (§ 105), which went to eo, is regularly written <o> (eg. socðen Ω9, souene Ω29, binoþen Ω89 etc), a form that, as above, was retained for longer in the West and SW, with unrounding to e taking place in all other areas.\textsuperscript{392} A further example of a probable WM or SW form found in L is the writing of em (Ω1 and Ω4) for the verb OE eom, eam, am (§ 101).

This localization can be narrowed down to the WM through the following examples: OE a before a nasal (§ 60) and before a lengthening group (§ 61) are mostly written as <o> (eg. mon Ω33, moni Ω39, bonke Ω70 etc and longe Ω3, pronge Ω170, honde Ω83 etc).\textsuperscript{393} In ME back /ɔ/ was retained only in the West Midlands (including Worcester), before nasals, before lengthening groups and with lengthening in open syllables; however, since ā (cf. § 69ff.), originating before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands, participated in the change from ā > o /ɔ:/, the writing of <o> in L before ng and nd might demonstrate a Midland or Southern form - it having been retained in

\textsuperscript{388} See Jordan § 71 and Jordan § 73. L also has heuen Ω43 and Ω64; suster Ω157 and Ω194 (ŋ in suster is written under the influence of w, see Wright § 52); fele Ω175 and Ω219; and pеle Ω162 and Ω233.

\textsuperscript{389} The exceptions in L are higθe Ω246, and see Ω208 and tening Ω266.

\textsuperscript{390} For the conditions of the i-umlaut of ēo see Campbell § 201. The only exception in L is bestre Ω77.

\textsuperscript{391} OE ēo + w gave /œaw/. This yielded /œːw/ in Western and Southwestern areas - a form retained into the fourteenth century. Other dialects, however, gave /œːw/ > /eːw/ (written <ew>) during the twelfth century (Jordan §109).

\textsuperscript{392} Jordan §74. The exceptions in L are: succen Ω216 (from lWS suð cán) - it was usual for the velar umlaut to be lacking before dentals in West Saxon; here Ω231 and Ω259, iclepede Ω109 and bidspe Ω112; and (be)uinen Ω45 and quiske Ω199.

\textsuperscript{393} See Jordan §80 and Mossé § 25. The exceptions in L are: bonke Ω254, banne Ω21 and Ω169 and manke Ω71 and prange Ω220 and prangepise Ω49.
these areas as well as being /ɔ/ in the WML – and cannot, therefore, be seen as a clear geographical indicator.

The writing of OE ū (§ 67) as <u> (eg. dude Ω99, gulte Ω224, muchel Ω12 etc and lutel Ω47, ihud Ω12, fure Ω44 etc)394 is another likely indicator of a WML provenance for L. This form was retained in the WML until about 1300, with unrounding reaching the West around the fourteenth century.395 In addition, OE æ (§ 63) is mostly written as <e> (hefde Ω16, Ω180, Ω129 etc)396, a form that was retained for longer in the WML and Kent.396 The quality a was generalized in the thirteenth century in the WML and in the fourteenth century in Kent. It therefore provides a good example of topographically and chronologically graduated transition, especially when L (predominantly e, with some a)397 is compared with the later J (almost exclusively a), considering that they share many other dialectal features. Further examples of the writing of WML <e> (eg. mei Ω17, Ω119, dei Ω165 etc)398 can also be seen in the ME writings of OE æ + 3 /j/ (§ 122), which follows the same path as OE æ (§ 63).399 Similarly, OE ea before r-combinations (§ 87 and § 88) – both without lengthening, and before rd and before rn – is nearly always e (eg. erge Ω20, middenerd Ω145, erninge Ω65 etc).400 The writing of <e> here can once again be seen as a feature of the WM or Kentish dialects, where OE ea was simplified, around 1000, to æ, if not already ‘smoothed’ during the OE period, and subsequently followed the process described previously (§ 63).401

394 For OE y L also regularly has writings with i (eg. jingl Ω5, ainst Ω38, king Ω51 etc) and twice with e (dede Ω2 and (v)rnet Ω5); for OE ū L has two occurrences of i (lite Ω12 and hpt Ω110).
395 See Jordan § 39 and § 42 and Mossé § 29.
396 See Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24. In the WML and Kent the sound was closed to e (written <e> but sometimes <ea> in the WML) representing the more fronted sound. In the other areas æ was retracted to a from around 1100 although the writing <e> (along with the Norman writing <œ>) remained in the twelfth century. Preceding w (semi-vowel) accelerated the transition to a in areas other than Kent which lacked this influence.
397 Although the more regular form is e, there are also examples of æ in L: habbe Ω3, pater Ω151, hpt Ω92 etc.
398 The only exception in L is mai Ω36, Ω44 and Ω70.
399 See Jordan § 93. For LWS sæde / Anglian sægde see § 123.
400 The only exceptions are arne Ω238 and paris Ω237.
401 For the breaking of æ before r see Campbell § 131, Campbell fn 1 of § 139, and Campbell § 144. For resultant features of ME dialects see Jordan § 88.
However, OE ea before ld (§ 91) acts in a different way to all other instances of OE ea.\footnote{Including OE ea before / which generally gave a in all dialects: Anglian unbroken a and a < ea by way of æ in Saxon and Kentish (See, § 90, Campbell § 143, and Jordan § 61).} Saxon Æa becomes Ē and subsequently ME e /ɛː/; Anglian Ī in the Midlands undergoes the change to o /ɔː/ but remains Ī in the North; in Kent Æa gives initial /jeː/ with the writing <ya> and <ia> found beside <yea> and <ea>, however, lengthening only occurred before intervocalic, and not final ld, with <a> often written in these instances.\footnote{See, Jordan § 61 and § 82.} For this discussion of L, however, it is important to note that while advancing Anglian /ɔː/ is found in both Worcestershire and Gloucestershire the AB dialect consistently writes a;\footnote{Jordan § 61: Remark 1} this is the form that is mostly found in L (eg. \textit{palde} Ω86, \textit{ald} Ω4, \textit{falde} Ω55 etc).\footnote{With the exception of \textit{pelde} Ω2 and \textit{pelden} Ω56.}

A further example that possibly gives clearer criteria for indications of geographical location is the writing of OE Ī (§ 69) as <a> in L (eg. \textit{lare} Ω1, \textit{ane} Ω88, \textit{nan} Ω115 etc);\footnote{Jordan § 44 and Mossé § 27. The exception in L is \textit{ƿori} Ω151. The writing of \textit{enne} (Ω144) and \textit{nenne} (Ω124) is likely as a result of Æ-umlaut of Ī in the acc. masc.} OE Ī + /ɪ/ (§ 137) as æg/ah (mage Ω30, agen Ω31, Ω113, Ω118 etc and \textit{ahen} Ω170);\footnote{See Jordan § 113.} and OE Ī + w (§ 138) as aw (mapen Ω23 and \textit{blape}Ω143) and au (iknauppen Ω170, \textit{knaud}Ω115, \textit{cnaud}Ω155 and \textit{saule} Ω143).\footnote{See Jordan § 105.} OE Ī was rounded to open [ɔː], written <o>, beginning in the WS area and Kent at the start of the twelfth century and spread through the southern half of the Midlands by the second half of the century; in the thirteenth century it had reached most of the West. The writing of <a>, however, was preserved in areas of the WML at this time, and was a feature of the AB dialect. A comparison with J, however, a text which also preserves many of the AB dialectical features, indicates that the writing of <a> was greatly reduced almost a century later. In the final example given above, the writing of aw and au for OE Ī + w cannot always so easily be used as an indicator of geographical location, as
in many dialects (including Kent and East Saxon) /au/ or [au] was widened to /au/ so the first component reverted to the /a/ quality, written <aw> or <au>.\(^{409}\)

Further evidence of a WML form (and possible AB dialect) can be seen in L in the writing of <a> in nakde (\(\Omega\)194, \(\Omega\)195, \(\Omega\)274 and \(\Omega\)276) and pald\(\epsilon\) (\(\Omega\)17, \(\Omega\)50, \(\Omega\)200 etc) for OE \(o\) (\(\S\) 65).\(^{410}\) This is, according to Jordan, as a result of a tendency in OE for opening of \(o\) between labials and liquids which resulted in <a> being written in the Mercian dialect as well as that of Northumbria. This was carried into the ME period with a forms reaching from the middle of Worcester and Hereford (including the AB dialect) up into southern Lancashire but also in the North including Scotland.\(^{411}\)

Finally, the retention of <c> for OE velar \(c\) (\(\S\) 23 and \(\S\) 24) in final position was extended for longer in the AB dialect,\(^{412}\) and is almost always the form in L (\(\beta\)onc \(\Omega\)72, lac \(\Omega\)74, perc \(\Omega\)133 etc). However, the writing of <c> is also found in many of the other texts of the Conduct of Life from this period that have no association with this region (eg. T and D) and might well reflect a period before transition to <k>. Conversely, the later text of J, which in other respects bears strong dialectal similarities to L, has only one instance where <c> is written (bec \(\Omega\)401). This alone cannot therefore be seen as a clear dialectal indication of geographical situation. However, two of the exceptions to <c> in L are ah (\(\Omega\)17, \(\Omega\)124 and \(\Omega\)125) and ach (\(\Omega\)59 and \(\Omega\)175), and exhibit a transition to the fricative in final position after an atonic vowel (/ax/ \(\S\) 26) – a feature retained from the OE Anglian dialect and found regularly in, and associated with, the ME AB dialect.\(^{413}\)

---

\(^{409}\) See Jordan \(\S\) 105, Remark I.

\(^{410}\) See Jordan \(\S\) 35. The writing of <a> is regular in these two examples but the text of L more regularly has <\(\epsilon\)> (eg. bitor\(\epsilon\)n \(\Omega\)28, bor\(\epsilon\) \(\Omega\)273, nolden \(\Omega\)251 etc).

\(^{411}\) Jordan \(\S\) 35.

\(^{412}\) See Jordan \(\S\) 178

\(^{413}\) See Jordan \(\S\) 178 Remark 3. Significantly, J also regularly writes ah (\(\Omega\)43, \(\Omega\)59, \(\Omega\)125 etc).
There is general agreement that the text of the *Conduct of Life* found in Digby contains strong Kentish features, which I evidence below. Hall locates the manuscript as being from Christ Church, Canterbury and suggests that it was probably copied there.\(^{414}\) Samuels suggests that 'the language of D showed either two layers of copying (Kent + London or London + Kent), or possibly a single scribe writing in the dialect of an area of Kent or Surrey bordering on London, i.e. North-West Kent or North-East Surrey.'\(^{415}\) Laing locates the language as being from West Central Kent (LAEME), arguing that the 'the language of the *Poema Morale* is clearly of Kent but seems to fit best somewhat to the west of Canterbury itself.'\(^{416}\)

Key features of D:

To begin with, OE *ea* before *l*, without lengthening (§ 90), is always written as *<a>* in D (eg. *al* Ω117, *ualle* Ω327, *palles* Ω42 etc). Breaking to *ea* only took place in the Saxon and Kentish dialects, with the Anglian dialect preserving *a*.\(^{417}\) However, without following lengthening groups, *ea* went to *æ* around 1000 and from 1100 to *a*. Since *a* < *ea* falls together with unbroken Anglian *a*, the writing is generally the same in the whole area.\(^{418}\) It is not possible, without further evidence, at this point to say whether *a* in D comes from breaking to *ea* or unbroken Anglian *a*. OE *ea* before *h* combinations (§ 93), on the other hand, gives *<e>* (*hege* Ω171 and Ω295, and *isegh* Ω274); in the Saxon and Kentish dialects this was smoothed to *e* from around 900, where the Anglian dialect has smoothed *æ*. However, all of the versions of

\(^{414}\) Hall, *Early Middle English, Notes*, p.313.
\(^{415}\) Samuels's views are recorded in Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*’, p.110.
\(^{417}\) Campbell § 143.
\(^{418}\) Jordan § 61.
the *Conduct of Life* have variants with *e*, so this alone gives little clue as to geography;\(^419\)
however, what is of interest is the lack of the front glide *i* (\(\text{æi}\)) in D, a transitional sound which
is lacking in the Kentish dialect.\(^420\)

OE *æ* (§ 63) is more frequently written *<e>* (*hedde* \(\Omega_{144}\), *elmesse* \(\Omega_{29}\), *after* \(\Omega_{65}\) etc),
this is probably as a result of a narrowing to an [\(\text{e}\)] sound (‘second fronting’) found in the
dialects of the WML and of Kent, where it is normally retracted to *a* from around 1100 in all
other dialects. This more fronted sound was generalized to *a* in the thirteenth century in the
WML and the fourteenth century in Kent.\(^421\) A preceding *w* (semi-vowel) accelerated the
transition to *a* in areas other than Kent which lacked this influence; significantly, D retains *<e>*
after *w* in *peter* (\(\Omega_{151}\) and \(\Omega_{261}\)), with *<a>* written only once in *pater* (\(\Omega_{253}\)). Similarly, the text of
D furnishes us with examples of *<e>* in the writings of OE *æ* + *ʒ* /\(j\)/ (§ 122: *mei* \(\Omega_{400}\), *sein* 
\(\Omega_{117}\) and *dei* /\(\text{i}\)/ *165,\(^422\) OE *æ*₁ (Angl. Kent, *<e>* /\(\text{ei}\)/) + *ʒ* /\(j\)/ (§ 124 and § 125: *mei* \(\Omega_{194}\), *isein* 
\(\Omega_{123}\), *isegen* \(\Omega_{101}\) and *ne-isegen* \(\Omega_{105}\)),\(^423\) and OE *æ*₂ + *ʒ* /\(j\)/ (§ 124 and § 126: *ei*\(\text{er}\) \(\Omega_{248}\)),\(^424\)

once again forms associated with the WML and Kent.\(^425\)

Many of the above examples are common to both the WML and Kent, but a form that
is found almost exclusively in the SEML and Kent is also regularly found in D: OE *æ* /\(\text{i}\)/ (§ 67) is
mostly written *<e>* (*dede* \(\Omega_{2}\), (\(\text{v}\))net \(\Omega_{5}\), *\(\text{b}\)enchen* \(\Omega_{63}\) etc and *fere* / *ver* \(\Omega_{44}\), \(\Omega_{159}\), \(\Omega_{161}\) etc,

\(^{419}\) It is possible that the writing of *<e>* in all versions of the *Conduct of Life* might be as a result of Saxon or Kentish *e*, with the
influence of the *e* forms spreading northward before being supplanted by the Anglian forms (Jordan § 63 Remark 1, and/or it is
possibly as a result of the more fronted sound found in WML and Kentish texts, written *<e>*. from *æ*, probably with lengthening to
\(\text{i}\)/ (§ 63 and Jordan § 32)

\(^{420}\) See Jordan § 32. This glide sound is found in TE2J

\(^{421}\) See Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24. As well as the more frequent writings with *<e>* there are also frequent *a* forms (*habbe* \(\Omega_{3}\) *hadde* 
\(\Omega_{16}\), *pater* \(\Omega_{253}\) etc).

\(^{422}\) See Jordan § 93: the more regular reading in D is with *<e>* (eg. *mais* \(\Omega_{17}\) and *das* \(\Omega_{383}\) etc).

\(^{423}\) See Jordan § 96.

\(^{424}\) See Jordan § 96: D also writes *<e>* in *\(\text{æ}\)ker* \(\Omega_{63}\) and *aider* \(\Omega_{317}\).

\(^{425}\) OE *æ*₁ + *ʒ* /\(j\)/ and OE *æ*₂ + *ʒ* /\(j\)/ yielded *\(\text{i}\)/ /\(\text{i}\)/ which shortened to *\(\text{i}\)/ around 1200 and then took part in the development of *\(\text{ei}\)/ > *a* in
the second half of the thirteenth century. (Jordan § 96).
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kedne $\Omega 102$ and kedde $\Omega 200$). OE ē was unrounded and lowered to ě in about 900 in the Kentish dialect. In ME this change was also found in the dialects of Sussex and Surrey (especially Essex and Suffolk), and was eventually also found in the City of London by the Middle of the fourteenth century.\(^{427}\)

In addition to the above examples, there are examples of forms found in D that can be specifically localized to the dialect of Kent: OE ea before ld (§ 91) in D is written with a mixture of <ia> (pialde $\Omega 86$, bialde $\Omega 56$ and bihialde $\Omega 299$) and <ea> (wealden $\Omega 56$, ealde $\Omega 324$, fealde $\Omega 55$ etc), with occasional <a> (alde $\Omega 298$ and halt $\Omega 323$). The writing of <ia> in D reflects a special development in the Kentish dialect, where when the lengthening group ld follows ē demonstrates a transfer of accent to /jɛ/. This /jɛ:/ is more stable in initial position and is shown through the writing <ya> and <ia> (probably a continuation of OKent ya.) beside <yea> and <ea>.\(^{428}\) Similarly, in the writing of OE ēa + w (§ 140) we can see the writing of <ia> (viaƿe $\Omega 109$ and $\Omega 361$) alongside <ea> (veaƿe $\Omega 366$).

Furthermore, an important indicator of geographical location in D is demonstrated through the writing of OE ēo (§ 108) as a mixture of <i> (bi $\Omega 2$, $\Omega 27$, $\Omega 100$ etc) and <ie> (bien $\Omega 40$, isien $\Omega 19$, lief $\Omega 74$ etc), written alongside <e> (ben $\Omega 44$, frend $\Omega 231$, isen $\Omega 392$ etc) and occasional <eo> (iseon $\Omega 297$ and $\Omega 398$ and deoflen $\Omega 100$) and <o> (dofles $\Omega 186$). In Kent OE ēo underwent a special development in OE and had already gone to īo;\(^{430}\) this went to ĕe in early ME. However, in final position the accent remained on the first component and as a result the

---

\(^{426}\) There are several exceptions to the writing of <e> in D, including regular <i> (þing$\Omega 368$, kinges $\Omega 335$, alfræt $\Omega 38$ etc and lītel/līte $\Omega 12$, $\Omega 47$, $\Omega 62$ etc, hidden $\Omega 169$ and hpp$\Omega 110$\(^{37}\)), alongside rarer occurrences of <o> (muchel $\tilde{e}$/mouthel $\Omega 12$, $\Omega 63$, $\Omega 75$ etc and sunegedon $\Omega 271$) for ē.

\(^{427}\) See Jordan § 39 and § 40 and Mossé § 29. However, Jordan § 40 Remark 2 notes that it is also possible that i(deriving from OE ē) could also have produced ē, and that this might cause difficulty in the interpreting of form with ē outside of Kent.

\(^{428}\) Jordan § 61 and § 82. It should also be noted that lengthening only occurred in Kentish before intervocalic, and not final ld, with <a> often being written in these instances (Jordan § 61); it is possible that the writing of <a> in the contracted form halt represents this.

\(^{429}\) See Jordan § 84 and § 85.

\(^{430}\) Kent first gave /jɛu/, where all other dialects yielded an/eu/ diphthong (Jordan § 107).
second often disappeared, therefore, we find $b\ddot{\imath}$ in D.\textsuperscript{431} In addition, <ie> ($\text{riepen} \Omega22$ and $\text{siepe} \Omega23$) is also written in examples where $w$ follows (OE $\ddot{e}o + \ w$: § 139).\textsuperscript{432} For the $i$-umlaut of $\ddot{e}o$ in Kent $\text{io}$ developed like the same sounds without umlaut; therefore, in D we mostly find <ie> ($\text{biestre} \Omega77$ and $\Omega79$, $\text{biesternes}e \Omega292$, $\text{nie}e \Omega274$ and $\text{dier}e \Omega153$ and $\Omega193$).\textsuperscript{433}

The final two examples that suggest a Kentish influence come from the consonants: the OE fricative $\gamma$ (§ 43) is retained and written $\varsigma$ ($\text{volge}\ddot{e}\Omega14$, $\text{ho}ge\ddot{e}\Omega52$, $\text{l}age \Omega179$ etc) in medial position, a form preserved in Kent into the fourteenth century, where all other dialects demonstrate a much earlier movement to $\gamma w/ > /w/ <w$.\textsuperscript{434} Finally, D regularly writes voiced [v] as $\langle v/u \rangle$ (§ 58) in initial position ($\text{vele} \Omega9$, $\text{volge}\ddot{e}\Omega14$, $\text{vor} \Omega17$ etc)\textsuperscript{435} and in medial position between vowels or other voiced sounds ($\text{himselue} \Omega14$, $\text{biuore} \Omega19$, $\text{euele} \Omega20$ etc).\textsuperscript{436} The transition to voicing in initial position takes place in the South and SWML particularly in Kent;\textsuperscript{437} elsewhere the spelling does not always reflect this. Similarly, it is more likely for a text from Kent to represent voiced [v] through the writing of $\langle v \rangle$ rather than the OE writing of $\langle f \rangle$, used for both [f] and [v].

All of the above evidence indicates a probable localization of D to Kent.

The Egerton Texts

Both of the texts of the Conduct of Life in Egerton contain strong South-Western linguistic features, as evidenced below. Laing (LAEME) contends that the language of both versions is of

---

\textsuperscript{431} See Jordan § 85.
\textsuperscript{432} See Jordan § 109. The exception in D is $\text{r}epen \Omega371$.
\textsuperscript{433} See Campbell § 201 and Jordan § 86. The exceptions in D are $\text{deorlinge} \Omega402$ and $\text{frend} \Omega294$ and $\text{frend} \Omega192$ and $\Omega315$.
\textsuperscript{434} Jordan § 186. $\langle f \rangle$ in $\text{draghen} \Omega30$ is still velar.
\textsuperscript{435} Less numerous, but still numerous, occurrences of $\langle f \rangle$ are also found: $\text{for} \Omega29$, $\text{frend}e \Omega35$, $\text{finde} \Omega35$ etc.
\textsuperscript{436} Rare instances of $\langle f \rangle$ are also retained: $\text{deolten} \Omega100$, $\text{life} \Omega120$, $\text{et}t\imath \Omega410$ etc.
\textsuperscript{437} Jordan § 215 and Mossé p. 39.
south-west Worcestershire, with the text of E1 possibly being more northern. Both texts, which were copied from the same exemplar, retain archaic grammar and orthography, with the scribe of E2 being more conservative than the scribe of E1. This has led Laing to believe that the text of E2 may well be deliberately archaic.

This section will, therefore, view the key dialectal features of E2 and E1 comparatively. Both texts have forms associated with both the SW and the WML:

OE ā (§ 67) is mostly written <u> in both E2 (duke Ω2, gulte Ω224, muchel Ω12 etc and lutel Ω212, late Ω273, hud Ω78 etc) and E1 (duke Ω2, gulte Ω224, muchel Ω12 etc and lutel Ω62, hud Ω78, fure Ω44 etc). In OE this sound was the i-mutation of u. In the WML (excluding almost the whole of Lancashire) and the South-West ā was retained into the ME period and was mostly written <u> but sometimes, when long, <ui> or <uy>. The /y/ sound (written <u>) is retained in the WML until about 1300. Unrounding also reaches the West around the fourteenth century. The regular writing of <u> for OE ā is a clear geographical indicator, likely placing both texts in either the SW or the WML.

In addition, both E2 and E1 preserve, with varying frequency, the close /ø/ sound for OE eo (§ 95), retained longest in the WML and part of the south (including the SW), where it was unrounded to e in EML, Kent and the North from the twelfth century, with the smoothed forms of the Anglian dialect having e from the late OE period. Before r-combinations OE eo

---

439 In addition to the examples provided here, see Hill, ‘Notes on the Egerton e Text’, pp. 353-357.
441 In E2, for OE ā <i> is regularly written in Ænce Ω63, king Ω51, sticche Ω198 etc; <y> is written once in mychel/Ω14; and <œ> twice in Ænce Ω212 and unpenne Ω219. In E2 for OE y <i> is written in lite Ω12, Ω62, Ω342 etc, lite Ω47 and hþi Ω110. In E1, for OE ā <i> is regularly written in Ænce Ω63, king Ω51, spilc Ω81, etc, with <œ> also written, more regularly than in E2, in deden Ω279, euel Ω265, a-ferst Ω38 etc. The more regular writing of <œ> in E1 might well be as a result of unrounding due to the text’s later date, a possibly more northern dialect, or a deliberate archaizing of the text by the scribe of E2. In E1 for OE y <i> is written in lite Ω12 and hþi Ω110.
442 See Jordan § 89 and § 42 and Mossé § 29. OE ā in the South-East including Kent was unrounded and lowered to ē and in the North and the East-Midlands by unrounding it became ë, written <e> or <y>.
443 See Jordan § 68.
§ 96) is always written <eo> in E2 (peorkes Ω64, heorte Ω75, storre Ω290 etc), with a mixture of <eo> (peorkes Ω267, heorte Ω75 and storre Ω290) and <e> (perche/perc Ω11, Ω113, Ω116 etc and perkes Ω64 and Ω73) found in E1. The verb OE eom, eam, am (§ 101) provides us with a further probable SW/WML geographical indicator. In both E2 and E1 we find both æm (Ω1) and eom (Ω4). Although reflexes of the eam form are often also found in the SW, the reflex of eom found in both of the Egerton texts (eax Ω1) can be seen as geographical markers. The writing of eom Ω4 in the second writing of the verb in E2 and E1 strengthens a SW localisation of these texts.

In the instances from OE where breaking to eo before l-combinations occur (§ 98), eo is retained in the Anglian dialects, later becoming smoothed e, with unrounded e becoming the dominant reading in most of the remaining areas. For example, in the Conduct of Life we find T: self Ω236 (unrounded) and L: solf Ω30 from the WML. In E2, however, and in some examples from E1, sulf /sylf/ is found (E2: sulfel/suluel/sulf Ω14, Ω33, Ω34 etc; E1: sulfel/sulne Ω14, Ω34, Ω112 and Ω116) from IWS sylf/silf, once more suggesting a SW influence. As in the previous examples, E2 more consistently has the more archaic variants, with <e> written twice only (seluel/self Ω26 and Ω119); whereas E1 has many more examples with <e> (seluel/self Ω26, Ω30, Ω33 etc) as well as <ue> (sulf Ω120 and Ω321) and <i> (silf Ω41). It is possible that the writing of <e> in E1 represents 1) Smoothed Anglian e, as a result of the text’s later date; 2) the influence of a more northern dialect upon the writing of E1; 3) the deliberate archaising of the spelling by the scribe of E2; or 4) the deliberate archaising of the exemplar that both E2 and E1 were copied from, with E1 ‘modernizing’ some instances and not others.

445 Breaking of e was regular only when [x] follows: eolh, seolh etc. and with the loss of [x], the inflected forms of these words (e.g. sēoles) – see Campbell § 146. See also Jordan § 68.

446 It is possible that silf is a reflex of IWS sylf/silf or that the writing of <i> rests on the development from e, according to the process described in § 64.3; a form more normally associated with the North.
The velar umlaut io of i (§ 105) likely also went to eo everywhere in OE. In ME this gave /ɔ/, with unrounding to e taking place as previously described; the front round vowel /ø/, written <eo, o, oe, u, ue>, was retained longest in the West Midlands and Southwest. In E2 <eo> and <u> (seouene Ω29, bi-neoðen Ω89, heore Ω104 etc, and icluped Ω109 and bi-clupien Ω112) are regularly written; however, as in previous examples, the forms in E1 are less archaic with <e> (bi-neþen Ω89, henne Ω417, here Ω104 etc) more regularly written alongside less frequent <eo> and <u> (heore Ω184, Ω237, Ω302 etc and seouene /seoue Ω29 and Ω149 and hure Ω272 and Ω287). In addition, in OE there was a lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW, which means that suððe Ω122 and syððen Ω29 in E2 and sutþe/sutþe Ω122 and Ω216 and syððen Ω9 in E1 are likely as a result of IWS syððaun – furthering the evidence for a SW localisation or influence.

OE ęo (§ 108) yields long /ɔ/, following a similar development to that of ęo > /ɔ/, and gives longer resistance to unrounding in the WML and the South than short ęo and is retained into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Both E2 and E1 mostly retain the forms associated with the WML and the South: E2 writes mainly <eo> (beon Ω40, seon Ω167, freond Ω31 etc), with E1, once again showing more variance, writing <eo> (beo Ω125, seon Ω398, freonde Ω231 etc), <o> (bo Ω33 and frond Ω31), <ue> (buen Ω181 and bue Ω33), and <u> (bud /budΩ24, Ω77, Ω295 etc), all forms indicating long /ɔ/, written alongside regular instances of <e> (ben Ω2, isen Ω19, leure Ω30 etc) and two occurrences of <i> (lif Ω270 and sic Ω208).

---

447 See Jordan § 74.
448 E2 also has <i> written in (be)-nime Ω45 and quike Ω80.
449 E1 also has <i> written in (be)-ninen Ω45 and quike Ω80.
450 See Jordan § 74.
451 E2 also has <e> written once in siððe Ω216.
452 See Jordan § 84. In the EML and the North this was unrounded to /e/, beginning in the twelfth century, where in Kent ęo had already gone to ę in OE, becoming ā, and with accent shifting /e/ in ME.
453 With <e> written in ben Ω2; <ie> in lief Ω270; and <i> in sic Ω208.
Similarly, OE ēo + w (§ 139) is written retaining <eo> in E2 (reope Ω371 and seopen Ω23), and in E1 (seopen Ω23); however, the movement /œu/ > /eu/ (written <ew>), which took place during the twelfth century in dialects other than the West and SW, is found in the writing of E1 (reope Ω371 and for the i-umlaut in untreunesse Ω279).

The writing of OE i-umlaut of ēo (§ 109) yields more complicated results in E2 and E1 but might also give further evidence of geography and variance. In E2 OE i-umlaut of ēo is written with a mixture of <eo> (freond Ω315, deore and neode Ω274) and <u> (frund Ω192 and Ω231, fund Ω294, bustre Ω77 and Ω79, bustrenesse Ω292 and dure Ω153); where, in E2 it is written with <e> (freond Ω192, Ω231 and Ω315, fend Ω294 and nede Ω274), <u> (bustre Ω77 and Ω79, busternesse Ω292, durlinges Ω402), <o> (dore Ω193), and <ue> (duere Ω153). As in the short i-umlaut of eo (§ 100), ēo was subject to i-umlaut in WS giving ȝ (and later ē) < ie. In ME, dialects of the Southwest demonstrate traces of WS ȝ; the otherwise predominating ēo and Kentish ēo developed like the same sounds without umlaut (cf, § 108). In E2 and E1 the writing of <u> is possibly from WS ȝ but could also possibly represent /œu/ from ēo, a form retained longest in the WMI and South. Both <o> and <ue>, written in E1, are also associated with the South and WMI.

Further probable SW forms in E2 and E1 are evident in the i-umlaut of ea before l combinations (§ 92), where ea could be subject to i-umlaut in WS and Kent, and where Anglian dialects had the mutation of a in the same position. In OE we find WS ie (later i and more frequently y), Anglian æ < unbroken a in Mercian / West Midland dialects (also penetrating into

---

454 With <u> written once in ruƿen Ω22 and for the i-umlaut of ēo + w in untreunesse Ω279.
455 With <u> written once in ruƿen Ω22.
456 For the nouns OE WS frēond and fēond, i-umlaut only took place in the pl. nom and pl. acc.
457 Campbell § 201.
458 Campbell § 200.
Gloucestershire and Worcestershire), and e in the North, EML and Kent. In ME this gives a from Anglian æ in the WML (cf. L: alder Ω1) with lengthened Æ/æ/ written <e> (cf. L: elde Ω17 and Ω18); in the East Midland, Kentish and Northern Dialects e was retained (cf. T and D: elder Ω1 and elde Ω18); and in the Southwest /y/ was often written <u> with i current in Devon and Somerset. In E2 SW <u> is written in ulptre Ω337 and ulde Ω337, and <y> is written in yleftde Ω18, alongside <e> in elder Ω1 and elde Ω17 and Ω338. E1, however, only writes the SW form ulde Ω390 once, with <e> written in elder /eldre Ω1 and Ω337 and elde Ω17, Ω18, Ω337 and Ω338 much more frequently, and the older form with <y> not present at all. Once again, the archaic forms are much more frequent in E2. In addition, E2 and E1 both demonstrate the /y/ reflex of unstable i, y<ie as i-umlaut of ea diphthongized by a palatal (after c) in the writing of chule Ω206 (§ 111 and § 113): a form found in scattered instances in the Southwest; the writing of <e> in the remaining readings (E2 and E1: chele Ω245, Ω246 and Ω247 and bicherd /bi-cherd Ω333) likely represents OE e without diphthongizing, and might reflect the writing of an earlier exemplar.

In the same way that i-umlaut of short ea gave /y/ in the Southwest, /y:/, often written <u>, is characteristic in the Southwest for i-umlaut of ěa (§ 107). The /y:/ sound was repressed early in most areas (probably before the end of the OE period in living speech) and, aside from the remains of Southwestern a /y:/, Anglian ě prevails in the rest of the area. E2 and E1 nearly always retain the writing of <u> (E2: ihurð Ω91, ihuren Ω276 and ilusd Ω141; E1: i-hurd Ω91, ihuren Ω276, a-luesd Ω141 and iluet Ω136), with the less frequent writing of <e> in E2 (ileue Ω50 and Ω183, leued Ω136 and temen Ω113) and E1 (ileued Ω183, ileue Ω50 and temen Ω113)

---

459 Jordan § 62.
460 Jordan § 62.
featuring only in rhyming position and more likely a reflection of an earlier exemplar, and possibly representing the language of the original.461

Reflexes of OE ie after palatal g (§ 116) and sce (§ 118), written <i/y>, <ie> and <u> in E2 (forȝitet Ω39, gieuen Ω65, for-gut Ω26 etc, and sculde(n) Ω231, Ω314, Ω316 etc and sculdeð Ω362) and E1 (forȝytet Ω39, gieudΩ198, guue Ω127 etc, and sculde Ω231, Ω314 and Ω348 and sculdeðΩ362),462 are also features associated with the SW. OE e became ie (later i, y) after palatal c, g, and sce in WS, but remained e in Anglian and Kent.463 Reflexes of OE ie or unstable i, y are found in the Southwest and in East Saxon, where the remaining regions have e.464 Furthermore, for OE ie after g (§ 117), the forms of WS ġīet (ġyēt), with diphthongization, and Anglian ġēt, without diphthongization, from OE ĝ exhibit the same development as ĝ. The writing of SW <u> and <y> in E2 (ġut Ω304 and Ω310 and ġyet Ω5) and <u> and <ue> in E1 (giatan Ω310 and ġyet Ω5)465 demonstrate the reflex of /y/.

In addition to the SW forms highlighted, and those forms that could be either WML or SW, there are forms present in E2 and E1 that further suggest a localisation in the WML. Within these examples, however, there is evidence of either (or both) topographical or chronological differences between E2 and E1.

OE æ (§ 63), which was retracted to a from around 1100 in areas other than the WML and Kent where the more fronted sound (written <e>, but sometimes <ea> in the WML) was retained for longer,466 is mostly written as <e> (hefΩ67, elmesse Ω29, petere Ω84 etc) in E2,

461 Jordan § 83.
462 E1 also writes sculde(n)/Ω316 and Ω319 a form that might be considered SW or East Saxon, however, this is a reading found across all MSS and might reflect a standardized form across all dialects at this time or a form found in an earlier exemplar of all MSS.
463 Wright § 91.
464 Jordan § 83.
465 E1 also has <e> written once in ġet Ω304.
466 The quality a is generalized in the thirteenth century in the WML and in the fourteenth century in Kent. See, Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24.
with the older writing of <æ> (after Ω65 and Ω124 and bed Ω229) also present.\textsuperscript{467} In comparison, E1 does retain occasional <e> (after Ω330, pet/hpet Ω24, Ω94, Ω103 etc, peder Ω249, sed Ω405) and, on one occasion, WML <ea> (bead Ω229), but the writing of <a> (habbe Ω3, almesse Ω29, after Ω65 etc) is the more regular. Possibly of significance is the writing of <e> in petere / pater Ω84, Ω151, Ω203 etc in E2, when a preceding w (semi-vowel) accelerated the transition to a in areas other than Kent, where a change might have been expected and where E1 demonstrates transition to <a> patere / pater Ω84, Ω151, Ω203 etc. Similarly, OE æ + ʒ /j/ (§ 122) is nearly always written with <e> (mei Ω17, Ω22, Ω28 etc, dei / deie Ω141, Ω165 and Ω383 and seid Ω117) in E2, with <a> found only once (sai Ω140); whereas the WM forms are present in E1 with the occasional writing of <e> (mei Ω22, seid / seid Ω117 and Ω140), but the writing of <a> (mai Ω17, Ω36, Ω41 and Ω45 and dai Ω141, Ω165 and Ω383) is more frequent.\textsuperscript{468}

When considering whether E2 and E1 are texts of the WML it is important to look at OE a before a nasal (§ 60), where by the late OE period the back sound /ɔ/, written <o>, was characteristic for the Anglian dialect while in the (West) Saxon geographical area it was written <a>. In ME back /ɔ/ was retained only in the WML (with the inclusion of Worcester) – before nasals, before lengthening groups and with lengthening in open syllables. The remaining territories, therefore the EML, South and North, have a.\textsuperscript{469} For example, in L we have mon Ω33, moni Ω39, ponke Ω70 etc and even in later texts such as J we have mon Ω15, mony Ω39, ponk Ω72 etc. However, in E2 and E1 we always find <a> (E2: manne Ω21, pan Ω72, panne Ω2 etc and E1 man Ω21, panke Ω70, panne Ω41 etc). It is possible to see in L and J the remanence of a form confined to a small area of the WML (which includes the AB dialect), but there is evidence from ME dialectal maps that the writing of <o> before m or n, during this period, was also found in

\textsuperscript{467} The writing of <æ> is only found in habbel/habb Ω3, Ω5, Ω7 etc, hai/hai Ω122, Ω150 and Ω181 and hadde Ω16.
\textsuperscript{468} See Jordan § 93.
\textsuperscript{469} Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25.
other WML areas, including Worcestershire and North Gloucestershire.\textsuperscript{470} The writing of \textless a\textgreater here does not however negate the possibility that the texts were from south-west Worcestershire, as Laing believes, but strengthens a localisation with a more southern influence, possibly even Gloucestershire itself.

Furthermore, the writing of OE \textless a\textgreater before a lengthening group (§ 61) furnishes us with further examples of difference between E2 and E1. Once again, E2 always writes \textless a\textgreater (\textit{lange} \(\Omega_3\), \textit{prange} \(\Omega_{170}\), \textit{hande} \(\Omega_{83}\) etc), however, E1 has mostly \textless o\textgreater (\textit{longe} \(\Omega_{176}\), \textit{stronge} \(\Omega_{294}\), \textit{honde} \(\Omega_{83}\) etc) with \textless a\textgreater (\textit{lange} \(\Omega_3\), \textit{hanged} \(\Omega_{323}\) and \textit{prange} \(\Omega_{170}\)) only occasionally found. It is possible to see in the writing of \textless o\textgreater in E2 a WML form, however, the writing of \textless o\textgreater in these instances are more likely to be as a result of a > \textit{o} /ɔ:/ found in the South and the Midlands.\textsuperscript{471} Rounding of \textit{a} giving \textit{o} /ɔ:/ began at the beginning of the twelfth century in the WS area, simultaneously probably in Kent. It spread in the second half of the twelfth century to almost the southern half of the Midlands, and almost the whole in the thirteenth century. During the thirteenth century it had reached most of the West.\textsuperscript{472} Therefore, the writing of \textless o\textgreater in E1 might be seen as a result of the text’s later date rather than a difference in geographical localization. Further examples can be seen in OE \textless ā\textgreater (§ 69) where E2 nearly always writes \textless a\textgreater (\textit{ane} \(\Omega_{88}\), \textit{nan} \(\Omega_{115}\), \textit{lac} \(\Omega_{74}\) etc), with \textless o\textgreater written twice only (\textit{lore} \(\Omega_1\) and \textit{pori} \(\Omega_{151}\)); whereas, E1 more often writes \textless o\textgreater (\textit{lore} \(\Omega_1\), \textit{one} \(\Omega_{218}\), \textit{non} \(\Omega_{60}\)\textsuperscript{42} etc) with still frequent writings of \textless a\textgreater (\textit{anne} \(\Omega_{144}\), \textit{nanne-mon} \(\Omega_{124}\), \textit{hatere} \(\Omega_{260}\) etc). Considering the date of E2 and a likely SWML localisation (the AB dialect, however, did preserve \textless a\textgreater, but other dialectal evidence suggests that this is not the dialect of either E2 or E1) it is surprising to see such regular writing of \textless a\textgreater. It is possible, therefore, that the movement a > \textit{o} /ɔ:/ had been completed in the dialect of the scribe of E2,

\textsuperscript{470} See Jordan § 30 and Jordan Dialectal Map p.53.
\textsuperscript{471} Jordan § 31 and Mossé § 25.
\textsuperscript{472} Jordan §44 and Mossé § 27.
and that the scribe deliberately archaized his text, or, as the still frequent writing of <a> in E1 might attest, that the exemplar that E2 and E1 were copied from had <a> and that the scribe of E2 was a faithful copyist, where the scribe of E1 more often modernized his text.

Similarly, the difference between the writing of <a> in E2 and <o> in E1 for ā can be further evidenced in examples before w and before /v/. As previously, OE ā + w (§ 138) and OE ā + /v/ (§ 137) in E2 are mostly written with <a> (icnape Ω170, blapeΩ143, saple Ω317 etc and mage /mäge Ω30 and Ω194 and age /aゲn Ω31, Ω113, Ω118 etc), with <ou> (saule Ω143) once and <o> (mopen Ω23) once; whereas, in E1 they are mostly written with <o> (mopen Ω23, and mọge Ω30, ọge Ω31 and hope /opе /open Ω118, Ω121, Ω170 etc) or <ou> (soule Ω143, Ω317 and Ω415 and blouƿe Ω143, and mouƿe Ω194), with less frequent writings of <a> (icnape /icnapen Ω170 and Ω399 and cnaped Ω115, and age Ω113 and apene Ω270).

Finally, there are numerous other examples where either E1 can be viewed as being progressive or E2 might be viewed as being archaistic. For example, E2 always retains the writing of <u> (cumelcumen Ω27, Ω164, Ω183 etc, punien Ω160, grunde Ω187 etc) for OE u (§ 68), where in E1 <o> is nearly always written in the verb come /comen Ω27, Ω164, Ω183 etc and comeωΩ74,473 but <u> (punien Ω160, grunde Ω187, sune Ω195 etc) is retained in all other examples. However, this is probably consistent with other examples as, although in OE u was probably already open [u], the first examples of <o> written for u are only found in the second half of the twelfth century with <o> still scattered until the second half of the thirteenth century when the graphical substitution was brought about in imitation of AN <o> and for clarity in the neighbourhood of similarly formed letters like <m, n, u, v, w>.474

\[473\] <u> is written once only in cumе Ω163.
\[474\] See Jordan § 37.
Another place where E1 appears to be more progressive than E2 is in the development and demonstration of glide-sounds. For OE \( \ddot{a} + h \) (§ 132) E2 writes \( \textit{fah} \Omega 378 \) and \( ah \Omega 2 \) (without glide), where E1 has \( fou \Omega 378 \) (with glide) alongside more traditional \( ah \Omega 2 \). In OE \( \dddot{\alpha} + h \) (§ 132 and § 133), E2 writes \( \textit{tehte} \Omega 283, \textit{eth}e \Omega 56 \) and \( ah\textit{te} \Omega 255 \) (without glide), where E1 has \( auht \Omega 255 \) and \( tauht\textit{e} \Omega 283 \) (with glide), alongside \( eth\textit{e} \Omega 56 \) and \( ei\textit{te} \Omega 43 \). Finally, in OE \( \ddot{o} + h \) (§ 134) E2 has \( un\textit{boht} \Omega 60, bi\textit{-boht} \Omega 8, bro\textit{hte} \Omega 192 \) etc (without glide), where E1 has \( vn\textit{-bout} \Omega 60, bi\textit{-bouht} \Omega 159, br\textit{ouhte} \Omega 192 \) etc (with glide), alongside \( bi\textit{-boht} \Omega 8 \).

**JESUS**

The language of this manuscript is WML and the text shares many of the forms found in the ‘AB’ dialect, as evidenced below, and also in Lambeth. Samuels locates the manuscript, specifically, to ‘South-East Herefordshire, just north of Ross near the Worcestershire border’\(^{475}\) with the LALME also adverting to the possibility of a Herefordshire dialect.\(^{476}\)

**Key features of J:**

The text of J exhibits several Anglian dialectal forms: OE \( \textit{eo} \) before \( l\)-combinations (§ 98) is written \( \textit{eo} \) (eg. \( \textit{seolf} \Omega 14 \) and \( \textit{seolue} \Omega 30 \) etc: Anglian /sølf/ ), one of many dialectal features J shares with L.\(^{477}\) In addition, OE \( \textit{ie} \) after \( g \) (§ 116) and OE \( \textit{ie} \) after \( g \) (§ 117) are always written \( \textit{e} \) (eg. \( \textit{for\text{-}yet} \Omega 26, \textit{yefte} \Omega 46, \textit{yelde} \Omega 46 \) etc, and \( \textit{yet} \Omega 25, \Omega 304 \) and \( \Omega 310 \) ), a form found in both the Anglian and Kentish dialects.\(^{478}\) Another feature that might indicate the influence of the Anglian dialect on the text of J is the vocalization of OE \( j/y \) \( to/i \) (§ 49) before

\(^{475}\) Hill, The Twelfth-Century Conduct of Life, p. 110.

\(^{476}\) Herefordshire. Linguistic Atlas Grid Reference: 372 244, LP 7440 (McIntosh, Samuels and Benskin 1986, p. 199).

\(^{477}\) For the breaking of \( e \) to \( eo \) before \( l\)-combinations see Campbell § 146; for ME Angl. /sølf/ (written \( \textit{seolf, solf} \) ); see Jordan § 68.

\(^{478}\) OE \( e \) became \( i\) (later \( i, y \)) after palatal \( c, g \), and \( sc \) in WS, but remained \( e \) in Anglian and Kent; see Wright § 91. Anglian \( \ddot{g}e\textit{t} \), without dipthongization, from OE \( \ddot{e} \) exhibits the same development as \( e \).
in the *pa.* form of the *OE* verb *seogan* (*seȳde Ω136, seide Ω164 and seýden Ω148 and Ω234*), a feature once again shared with L, where *j/*j/* was lost before *d* with the lengthening of the previous vowel in the writings of the West Saxon dialect, and probably also that of Kent, during the *OE* period.479

J also has many forms associated with the WML, which might also be found in the South and SW: The writing of *<e>* (werke Ω11, Ω121, Ω186 etc and werkes Ω64, Ω108, Ω116 etc) for *OE* eo before *r*-combinations (§ 96) suggests a smoothed Anglian form; however, the writing of *<eo>* in heorte Ω75, Ω118, Ω300 and Ω320 and steorre Ω290 preserve the */ø/* sound found for longer in the WML and parts of the South.480 In these areas this sound was retained until around 1300;481 considering the later date of J this might be seen as a clear indicator of the localisation of this text or the exemplar from which it was copied. Similarly, *OE* eo resulting from the *u* umlaut of *e* (§ 102 and § 104) and the *a* umlaut of *e* (§ 102 and § 103) is regularly written as *< eo> /ø:/* (heouene Ω28, Ω76, Ω83 etc and heoueriche Ω43, Ω66, Ω185 etc, and veole/ueole/feole Ω9, Ω10, Ω100 etc and weole Ω162, Ω233 and Ω386) and *<o>* (world and worldes Ω162, Ω282, Ω330 etc), where *eo* by back mutation then follows the course described previously for *eo* by breaking.482

*OE* ēo (§ 108) corresponds to short ēo with the long diphthong giving the long */ø:/* sound, which gives longer resistance to unrounding in some areas of the WML and parts of the south than ēo, but is unrounded to */e:/* elsewhere from the twelfth century. In J, therefore, we found the almost

---

479 Jordan § 192.
480 Jordan § 65.
481 Jordan § 65.
482 See Jordan § 71 and Jordan § 73. J writes *<e>* once in heuenliche Ω99 for the *u*-umlaut of *e* and *<u>* in suster (*u* in suster is written under the influence of *w*; see Wright § 52). J writes *<e>* twice for the *a*-umlaut of *e* in weed Ω1380 and brekeΩ93. For the condition in which back mutation occurred see Campbell § 205).
exclusive writing of <eo> (eg. beo Ω2, seon Ω167, leof Ω30 etc).\textsuperscript{485} Similarly, the \textit{i}-umlaut of ēo (§ 109) is always written <eo> (eg. freond Ω192, feond Ω294, feostre Ω77 etc).

OE ēo + w (§ 139) is written <eo> in reowe Ω22 and seowe Ω23, a form associated with the dialects of the West and the SW, with <e> written once in rewe Ω371 and once in untrewnesse Ω279 (\textit{i}-umlaut).\textsuperscript{486} Similarly, the velar umlaut \textit{i}o of \textit{i} (§ 105), which went to \textit{eo}, is regularly written <eo> (eg. bi-cleopien Ω112, seoue Ω149, heore Ω104 etc), a form that, as above, was retained for longer in the West and SW, with unrounding to \textit{e} taking place in all other areas.\textsuperscript{486}

This localization can be narrowed to the WM through the following examples: OE a before a nasal (§ 60) and before a lengthening group (§ 61) are mostly written as <o> (eg. mon Ω15, mony Ω39, bonk Ω72 etc and longe Ω3, pronge Ω170, honde Ω83 etc).\textsuperscript{487} In ME back /ɔ/ was retained only in the WML (including Worcester) before nasals, before lengthening groups and with lengthening in open syllables; however, since \textit{a} (cf. § 69ff.) originating before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands participated in the change from \textit{a} > o /ɔ/ the writing of <o> in J before \textit{ng} and \textit{nd} might demonstrate a Midland or Southern form where it was retained as well as being /ɔ/ in the WML, and cannot, therefore, be seen as a clear geographical indicator.

The writing of OE \textit{y} (§ 67) as <w> (eg. dude Ω2, bunchen Ω63, agult Ω11 etc and lutel Ω12, ihud Ω12, fure Ω44 etc)\textsuperscript{488} is another likely indicator of a WML provenance for J. This form was retained in the WML until about 1300, with unrounding reaching the West around the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{489} In addition, occasional <e> (beuvede Ω16, hedde Ω144 and Ω156, brek Ω192 and hwebper

\textsuperscript{483} The exceptions in J are be Ω260, dëwe Ω44 and sek Ω208.

\textsuperscript{484} For the conditions of the \textit{i}-umlaut of \textit{eo} see Campbell § 201.

\textsuperscript{485} OE ēo + w gave /æwl/. This yielded /æwl/ in Western and Southwestern areas – a form retained into the fourteenth century. Other dialects, however, gave /æwl/ > /æul/ (written <ew>) during the twelfth century (Jordan §109).

\textsuperscript{486} Jordan §74. The exceptions in J are: bi-neben Ω89, icedepen Ω109 and sëben Ω112, and (by)nyne Ω45, quyke Ω80 and Ω199 and nyfe Ω310.

\textsuperscript{487} See Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25. The exceptions in J are: mannes Ω31 and puri janci Ω1, Ω2, Ω21 etc.

\textsuperscript{488} For OE y J also regularly has writings with \textit{i}y/ (eg. punche Ω123, a-virst Ω38, kyng Ω227 etc); for OE y\textit{r} J has only occurrences of \textit{i} (hwir Ω110\textsuperscript{2}).

\textsuperscript{489} See Jordan § 39 and § 42; and Mossé § 29.
Ω249) is still written for OE æ (§ 63), a form that was retained for longer in the WML and Kent. The quality æ was generalized in the thirteenth century in the WML and in the fourteenth century in Kent. It therefore provides a good example of topographically and chronologically graduated transition, especially when J (mostly æ, with only occasional e) is compared with L (predominantly e, with some æ), considering that they share many other dialectal features. Similarly æ is written only in seyþ Ω117, Ω119 and Ω140, with æ more regular in may Ω17, Ω19, Ω22 etc and day Ω141, Ω165 and Ω363, for ME writings of OE æ + ð /j/ (§ 122), which follows the same path as OE æ (§ 63), where the text of L still retains the more regular writing of æ (eg. mei Ω17, seid Ω119, dei Ω165 etc). Similarly, OE ea before r-combinations (§ 87 and § 88) without lengthening gives æ (erewe Ω20) only once, with æ (harf Ω44 and Ω46, arme Ω238, swarte Ω293 and narewe Ω355) nearly always written. Before rn, æa earnythe Ω65) is written only once, with æ written in warnythe/parnythe Ω237, Ω239 and Ω315. Before rd, æ is more regularly found in (middelherd/ (myddelherd Ω145, Ω202 and Ω207, alongside æ in harde Ω178. These examples certainly suggest a WM dialect for J, but, when compared to L, where the forms are consistently written with æ, a later date transition can also be recognized.

Another example to emphasise the chronological, and possible topological, differences between J and L might be seen in their treatment of ea before ld (§ 91). Anglian æ in the Midlands undergoes the change to o /ɔ/; however, while advancing Anglian /ɔ/ is found in both

---

490 J, however, mostly writes æ (habbe Ω23, almes Ω29, after Ω29 etc).
491 See Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24. In the WML and Kent the sound was closed to e (written æ but sometimes æa in the WML) representing the more fronted sound. In the other areas æ was retracted to a from around 1100 although the writing æa (along with the Norman writing æa) remained in the twelfth century. Preceding w (semi-vowel) accelerated the transition to æ in areas other than Kent which lacked this influence.
492 See Jordan § 93. For LWS séd/. Anglian sedge see § 123.
493 The only exception in L is mai Ω36, Ω41 and Ω70.
494 OE ea was simplified, around 1000, to æ, if not already ‘smoothed’ during the OE period, and subsequently followed the process described previously (§ 63). For the breaking of æ before r see Campbell § 131, Campbell fn 1 of § 139, and Campbell § 144. For resultant features of ME dialects see Jordan § 58.
495 Including OE ea before / which generally gave a in all dialects: Anglian unbroken a and æa by way of æ in Saxon and Kentish (See, § 90, Campbell § 143, and Jordan § 61).
Worcestershire and Gloucestershire the AB dialect consistently writes a.\textsuperscript{496} This is the form that is mostly found in L (eg. palde Œ86, ald Œ4, falde Œ55 etc).\textsuperscript{497} but in the writing of J the change to o /ɔ/ is demonstrated (wolde Œ56, old Œ4, folde Œ55 etc).\textsuperscript{498} In addition, the writing of OE ā (§ 69), OE ā + /ɣ/ (§ 137),\textsuperscript{499} and OE ā + w (§ 138)\textsuperscript{500} gave a much clearer idea of the geographical location of L, as the retention of <a> demonstrated an expected WMl localisation and a likely association with the AB dialect. However, in J the writing of <a> was greatly reduced almost a century after L, with rounded open [ɔː], written <o>, the regular form. Therefore, OE ā is mostly <o> (lore Œ1, one Œ216, non Œ60 etc);\textsuperscript{501} OE ā + /ɣ/ is always <o> (mowe Œ30 and owe /owen Œ31, Œ113, Œ118 etc); and OE ā + w is <ow> (iknowe Œ170, (i)knowe Œ115 and Œ142 and blowe Œ143) and <ou> (soule Œ143 and Œ317 and soulen Œ297), with <au> written once (saule Œ415).

Finally, however, there are some further features that L and J do share that might advance our analysis. Both texts vocalize OE palatal þ ili/ (§ 49) to /i/ before d (L: seide Œ136, iseid Œ148 and seiden Œ234; J: seýde Œ136, seide Œ164 and seýden Œ148 and Œ234),\textsuperscript{502} a probable Anglian feature lost in the Saxon and Kentish dialects.\textsuperscript{503} For the retention of <c> for OE velar c (§ 23 and § 24) in final position, retained longest in the AB dialect,\textsuperscript{504} J once again demonstrates difference, with <c> (bec Œ401) only written once and <k> (ek Œ1, werk Œ121, Œ72 etc) the regular reading, where L almost always has <c> (/ponc Œ72, lac Œ74, perc Œ133 etc); however, both L and J also share examples of <h> [x] in final position (L: ah Œ17, Œ18).
Ω124 and Ω125; J: ah Ω43, Ω59, Ω125 etc) exhibiting a transition to the fricative in final position after an atonic vowel (/ax/ § 26) – a feature retained from the OE Anglian dialect and found regularly in, and associated with, the ME AB dialect.506

McCLean

The dialectal features of McClean are somewhat mixed and localization has, as a result, been difficult. Samuels believes the language to be of Essex with a western dialect layer,507 while Jordan places it in Kent.508 However, Laing’s contention (LAEME) placing it in Central Gloucestershire has now generally been accepted, along with her belief that ‘the apparently recalcitrant elements [were] perhaps ... current also in the SW Midlands at that time.’509

Key features of M:

Jordan’s location of McClean to Kent is never elucidated, but it is probable that it stems from a combination of examples such as the following found in M: the OE fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43) is always written <ȝ> (moȝe Ω30, oȝe Ω31, draȝe Ω48 etc). The fricative /ɣ/ was labialized and vocalized to /yw/ > /w/ <w> from c. 1200, in medial position, after a tonic vowel. This began in the South West Midlands and spread to the North Midlands and the North. Kent, however, preserved the writing of <ȝ> throughout the 14th century.510 It is surprising, therefore, considering the later date of M, to find a text outside of this area (Kent) that still retains writings with <ȝ>.

506 See Jordan § 178 Remark 3.
508 Jordan, p. 10.
510 Jordan §186.
In addition, OE ēa (§ 106) furnishes us with a mixture of variants, some of which might suggest a Kentish localisation; the ones important to this discussion concern the writing of <ȝe> in ȝehte ∊Ω75, ∊Ω157 and ∊Ω270 and ȝedi ∊Ω238 and possibly also <ie> in lien ∊Ω65 and <ia> in diaþe ∊Ω120. The diphthong ēa /æː/ follows a parallel movement to that of short ēa (cf. § 87) and was monophthongized to ē around 1000 in most places. However, the Kentish dialect shows a special development in relation to ēa, with evidence of the writing of ie (like the development ēo > iō), indicating a narrowing of the first component. As a result of the lessening of sonority in this first component there is therefore often a transfer of accent to /jeː/. These remained more often in initial position where the sound was more stable. The writing of <ȝe> likely represents this, and possibly also <ie>, but as Jordan writes, ‘naturally one must reckon with inconsistencies and transferences in the writing’. For instance, the writing of <ȝe> is also found in E2 (ȝedi ∊Ω238), at the same place as M, and <ie> for OE ēa is present in both E texts (E2: ieþe ∊Ω299, lien ∊Ω65, briede ∊Ω198 etc; E1: dieþe ∊Ω191, unieþe ∊Ω363 and lyen ∊Ω65), where neither text has any other strong Kentish features. It is possible that these readings might come from a now lost exemplar or that these features were also present outside of Kent in dialects of the SWMI. The writing of <ia> in diaþe ∊Ω120 is more difficult and Jordan suggests that ME <ya> and <ia> occurring beside <yea, ea> can be seen as a continuation of Old Kent ya, and that in medial position /j/ was retained only after certain consonants, such as dentals, which favoured it. This is of course possible in M but this is one example compared to many that suggest something different.

511 However, McClean mostly writes <e> in eke ∊Ω112, vansieþe ∊Ω198, deþe ∊Ω111 etc.
512 Jordan § 82.
513 Jordan § 82.
514 Jordan § 82.
In addition to the above OE ea before ld (lengthening group, § 91) once again gives an example with <ȝe> (gelde Ω298 and Ω324). However, considering the discussion above, what is of more interest is the retention of <e> (pelden Ω56, eld Ω4, felde Ω55 and Ω260 etc) in M.\(^{515}\) The writing of <e> suggests a southern form (/e:/ < ea through <ea, e>), with the exception of Kent which normally has <ya> and <ia> written beside <yea> and <ea>, retained into the fifteenth century in East Saxon (including Essex and London),\(^{516}\) where Anglian ā in the Midlands undergoes the change to o /ɔ:/ (advancing /ɔ:/ is found in both Worcester and Gloucester) while the North retains ā and the AB dialect writes a.\(^{517}\) However, M does not retain East Saxon ā (found only in a small area of the EML and London) for either OE ā₁ or OE ā₂ (§ 70ff);\(^{518}\) in both instances the reading is mostly <e> (dede Ω3, rede Ω4 a-adrede Ω166 etc and mest Ω7, unhelpe Ω17, lest Ω62 etc). The only writings of <a> (ilad Ω5, ladde Ω95 and ani Ω54), written with shortening, are found in OE ā₂ and are shared in at least one other manuscript version, suggesting that they are forms common to more than one dialect, or that they are written under influence of a previous exemplar.

Finally in this section, the writing of OE e (§ 64) provides a further possible Kentish or East Anglian reading. M nearly always writes <e> (bere Ω98, ende Ω53, felde Ω360 etc) but has <i> in sigge Ω94 and Ω156.\(^{519}\) In closed syllables there was an increased tendency from about 1200 for e to go to i under influence of apical sounds, with preference for this change, but not exclusively, in the North. This occurred before dentals, before covered n, and before palatals. According to Jordan, in Kent and East Anglia i appeared before /dʒ/ in siggen ‘to say’.\(^{520}\) It is

---

515 <ā> is also written in hālt Ω323 and <āe> in bihelde Ω299.
516 Jordan § 61.
517 Jordan § 61 and § 82.
518 Jordan § 50 and Mossé § 28: Remark IV.
519 M also has angles and angle, probably influenced by OF anglene, angle.
520 Jordan § 33 and § 34.
possible that sigge does represent a Kentish form but it is also possible that this form was also in use outside of the Kentish and East Anglian dialects.

I believe that what Samuels claims to be a western dialect layer are actually more recognizable features of a SWM dialect in M. To begin with, M more regularly vocalizes OE palatal ʒ /j/ (§ 49) to /i/ before d (seid Ω164 and Ω234 and ileid Ω12). a probable Anglian feature lost in the Saxon and Kentish dialects, and one that is shared with both J and L, both texts from the WML. For OE a before a nasal (§ 60) M mostly writes <a> (man Ω21, banne Ω41, phane Ω6 etc), but the writing of <o> in ponke Ω70 and Ω254 and ponc Ω72 and Ω92 suggest a possible WML influence, where in ME back /ɔ/ was retained for longest. In addition, OE a before a lengthening group (§ 61) is nearly always written <o> (longe Ω3, stronge Ω294, honde Ω83), another feature found in the writing of the West Midlands; here, however, <o> in M might not represent a WML dialectal feature but rather a product of the text’s later date, as a before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands participated in the change from ə > o /ɔ/ (§ 69ff).

OE eo before r-combinations (§ 96ff) is mostly written <o> (porkes Ω73, Ω113, Ω116 etc, porclpork Ω186 and Ω267) with <u> (purkes Ω64 and sturre Ω290) written twice, and <e> (herte Ω75, Ω118 and Ω320) found on three occasions but always in the same word. The /ɔ/ sound, written <o> in M, was a form retained until around 1300 in the WML and parts of the South. Unrounding to e began in the twelfth century in the EML, Kent and probably also the North – with the Anglian dialect having smoothed e from the late OE period. It is possible,

---

521 M writes sede Ω136 once.
522 Jordan § 30; Mossé § 25.
523 Jordan § 30; Mossé § 25. The only exception in M is the writing of <a> in lange Ω330.
524 The writing of <u> in purkes Ω64 is possibly under the influence of w and may represent a Saxon form, see Jordan § 66: Remark 3. On two occasions the vowel is absent in M: prke Ω11 and prc Ω256.
525 Jordan § 65.
however, that the writing of <o> in the above examples is under the influence of w, as the following might also attest: in OE eo (a umlaut of e; §102 and §103) / ø / has been unrounded to e, written <e> (vele/u/e/le Ω9, Ω10, Ω100 etc, breke/Ω93, unureme Ω237 and pele/pe/ le/Ω233, Ω330 and Ω380) in all instances, but in OE eo (u umlaut of e; §102 and §104), although <e> (heuen Ω76 and Ω83, heueneriche Ω43 and Ω185, heu/en/liche Ω99 etc) is the regular form, there are several occurrences of <o> (porl/ul/orld, porl/des Ω282, Ω330, Ω346 etc and pode Ω360) when preceded by w.526 However, it is possible that the predominant writing of <e> in the examples from eo (a umlaut of e) are due to a lack of back mutation, with this only taking place in the Anglian and Kentish dialects;527 it is possible, therefore, that the readings in M are either developments associated with the later date of the text, an admixture of dialectal layers, or specific dialectal features of an area, possibly further South than the traditional area of the OE Anglian dialect.

While the writing of <o> in the examples from OE ēo might prove inconclusive, possibly pointing to the influence of w, the regular writing of <eo> (beo Ω2 etc, beo/b Ω20, i/eo Ω19 etc) for OE ēo (§108) certainly suggests at least a WML or Southern admixture in the dialect of M. However, it should be noted here that the more dominant form in M is <e> (ben Ω44, le/e Ω45, frend Ω31 etc), with <i> (sike Ω208) written once.528 If a SWML dialect is accepted, the retention of the writing of <eo> / ø / might not be surprising in M as / ø / gives longer resistance to unrounding than ēo / ø / in areas of the WML and the South and, in some instances, was retained into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, where in the EML and the North unrounding to / e / began in the twelfth century. The more dominant writing of <e> in

526 <o> is also written in suster – probably under the influence of w.
527 See Campbell §205 for the conditions under which back mutation took place, and Jordan §71 for a fuller explanation of the ME.
528 The development of OE ēo is similar to that of ēo / ø / (cf. §95), with a special development taking place in Kent (cf. §). See Jordan §84.
all the previous examples might, therefore, be seen as the process of unrounding in M indicative of its later date, with the retention of <eo> for /oː/, an indicator of an older western or southern dialectal layer, or, if considered alongside other evidence from the text, confirmation of current dialect demonstrating later development and change.

Some of the strongest evidence for a possible SWML provenance for M is given by the regular writing of <u> (dude, gulte, muchel etc, and fur(e) and cuʃe) for OE ſ (§ 67), a form retained in the WML until about 1300, and which is still found in Gloucestershire toward 1400. However, in addition to the writings with <u>, there is also regular <e> (misede, (vn)net, pencheʃ etc and (vn)hed), especially in ſ, and regular <i> (pinshe, aurist, king(e)s etc and litel / litle and lite). The writing of <e> might point to a Kentish dialect or a dialect of the South East, with ſ unrounded and lowered to ſ in Kent from around 900, and spreading to Sussex and Surrey, the SEML and the city of London in the ME period. However, evidence suggests that ſ (deriving from OE ſ) could also give rise to ſ. In M the writing of <i> might also represent a Northern or EML dialectal feature, with instances of unrounding found in Northumbrian already in late OE, with this spreading into the NEML in the eME period. However, unrounding to i was also present in some West Saxon subdialects of the OE period and, in addition, the spread of i from the NEML had probably already reached the West in the fourteenth century. The writing of <i> and <e> in M, therefore, cannot be seen as clear geographical determinants, where the writing of <u> points to a probable WML or SWML form. The forms other than <u> are possible representations of later unrounding, or are examples of forms long current in the dialect of that region.

---

529 Jordan § 42.
530 Jordan § 39 and § 42; Mossé § 29.
531 Jordan § 39 and § 41; Mossé § 29.
Finally, throughout M there are further traces of SW and WML forms that suggest a SWML dialect or a proximity to the OE WS geographical area; for example, the writing of \(<u>\) (\(\text{subbe} \Omega 216, \text{icluped} \Omega 109\) and \(\text{hure} \Omega 104, \Omega 251, \Omega 259\) etc) for velar umlaut \(\text{i}o\) of \(\text{i}\) (§ 105);\(^{532}\) the writing of \(<u>\) (\(\text{ihur} \Omega 91\)) for \(\text{i-}\)umlaut of \(\text{ē}\) (§ 107);\(^{533}\) and the writing of \(<u>\) (\(\text{busternesse} \Omega 292\)) for the \(\text{i-}\)umlaut of \(\text{ēo}\) (§ 109), which might represent WS \(\text{y}\) (§ 109) but also possibly \(\text{i}/\text{o}/\) from \(\text{ēo}\).\(^{534}\) However, there are instances where forms associated with a SWML dialect might be expected but are absent, such as: OE \(\text{æ}\) (§ 63), which is always \(<a>\) (\(\text{habbe} \Omega 3, \text{patere} \Omega 84, \text{phat} \Omega 80\) etc) in M; and OE \(\dot{a}\) (§ 69), which is nearly always \(<o>\) (\(\text{lore} \Omega 1, \text{one} \Omega 381, \text{non} \Omega 115\) etc). For these and other examples in M it is possible to see a more widespread generalization disrupting a more specific localization of the text. In the first example, \(<e, ea>\) was retained for longer in the WML and Kent but by the thirteenth century in the WML the quality \(\text{a}\) is mostly found.\(^{535}\) In the second example, neutralization to \(\text{o}\) began at the beginning of the twelfth century in the WS area and probably around the same time in Kent, and had reached most of the West by the thirteenth century.\(^{536}\) The writing of \(<a>\), which was probably preserved in the Southumbrian region for longest in areas of the WML (including the AB dialect), the West, and the NEML became, by the fourteenth century, a dialectal criteria of the North.

\(^{532}\) See, Jordan § 74. M also has \(<e>\) in \(\text{seue} \Omega 149, \text{binebe} \Omega 89, \text{selure} \Omega 278, \text{hennie} \Omega 417; <e>\) in \(\text{hure} \Omega 184, \Omega 220, \Omega 272\) and \(\Omega 358; <e>\) in \(\text{subbe} \Omega 359, \text{binime} \Omega 45, \text{subbe} \Omega 39\) and \(\text{quike} \Omega 80\). The writing of \(<u>\) in \(\text{subbe} \Omega 216\) might also reflect the lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW.

\(^{533}\) See Jordan § 83. The \(\text{iy}/\text{y}/\) sound was repressed early (probably before the end of the OE period in living speech) and, aside from the remains of Southwestern \(\text{u}/\text{y}/\) Anglian \(\dot{e}\) prevails in the rest of the area. The remaining readings are all written with \(<e>\): \(\text{yleue} \Omega 50\) and \(\Omega 183, \text{leyue} \Omega 36, \text{teme} \Omega 115, \text{ilesed} \Omega 141\).

\(^{534}\) See Campbell § 201 and Jordan § 86. The \(<e>\) form is however overwhelmingly dominant: \(\text{frend} \Omega 192, \text{fend} \Omega 294, \text{dere} \Omega 153\) etc.

\(^{535}\) Jordan § 32; Mossé § 24.

\(^{536}\) Jordan § 44; Mossé § 27.
## CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Initially § 2</td>
<td>Nearly always: <em>ban</em>, <em>beih</em>, <em>pinched</em> etc</td>
<td>Nearly Always: <em>ban</em>, <em>beih</em>, <em>pinched</em> etc</td>
<td>Nearly Always: <em>ban</em>, <em>beih</em>, <em>pinched</em> etc</td>
<td>More Regular: <em>pen</em>, <em>banne</em>, <em>beih</em>, <em>pinched</em> etc</td>
<td>More Regular: <em>penne</em>, <em>banne</em>, <em>beih</em>, <em>pinched</em> etc</td>
<td>Always: <em>ban</em>, <em>beih</em>, <em>pinched</em> etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medially § 4</td>
<td>Rare: <em>bi\slohte</em>, <em>ophe</em>, <em>op\pinched</em> etc</td>
<td>Frequent (often before final –e): <em>iselpe</em>, <em>un\helpe</em>, <em>pinched</em> etc</td>
<td>Interchangeable with <em>\sloper</em>, <em>sleuh\hen</em>, <em>lofe</em></td>
<td>Rare: <em>n\qpened</em>, <em>\caphe</em>, <em>n\qpe</em> etc</td>
<td>Usual: <em>ique\pened</em>, <em>\caphe</em>, <em>n\qpe</em> etc</td>
<td>Nearly always: <em>\qpehe</em>, <em>\caphe</em>, <em>n\qpe</em> etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finally</td>
<td>Once: <em>\qpeh</em></td>
<td>Less regular form: <em>b\peh</em>, <em>\qpeh</em>, <em>\qpeh</em> etc</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rare: <em>fol\qpened</em>, <em>\qpeh</em>, <em>\qpeh</em> and <em>\qpeh</em></td>
<td>Rare: <em>ol\qpened</em>, <em>\qpeh</em>, <em>\qpeh</em> and <em>\qpeh</em></td>
<td>Always: <em>\qpened</em>, <em>fol\qpeh</em>, <em>bi\sloked</em> etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Initially § 3</td>
<td>Once: <em>\q\per</em></td>
<td>Once: <em>\q\per</em></td>
<td>Once: <em>d\r</em> (written <em>\rd</em>)</td>
<td>Frequent: <em>\q\r</em>, <em>\q\per</em>, <em>\q\per</em> etc</td>
<td>Occasional: <em>\q\per</em>, <em>\q\per</em>, <em>\q\per</em> etc</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medially § 4</td>
<td>Usual form: <em>\q\cute</em>, <em>sed\en</em>, <em>ex\er</em> etc</td>
<td>Most regular form: <em>ique\pened</em>, <em>s\q\d\en</em>, <em>\q\cute</em> etc</td>
<td>Interchangeable with <em>\q\scild\en</em>, <em>i\q\cute</em>, <em>\q\cute</em> etc</td>
<td>Usual: <em>ique\pened</em>, <em>s\q\d\en</em>, <em>\q\cute</em> etc</td>
<td>Occasional: <em>s\q\d\en</em>, <em>\q\cute</em>, <em>\q\cute</em> etc</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finally § 4</td>
<td>Usual form: <em>\pinched</em>, <em>\q\q\f\q\u\q\e\rd</em>, <em>m\q\il\c\u\q\d</em> etc</td>
<td>Usual form: <em>m\q\s\k\e\rd</em>, <em>\f\q\u\q\e\rd</em>, <em>bis\q\pek\e\rd</em> etc</td>
<td>Always: <em>\q\pinched</em>, <em>mis\q\q\k\e\rd</em>, <em>\q\f\q\g\e\rd</em> etc</td>
<td>Usual: <em>\q\pinched</em>, <em>bis\q\pek\e\rd</em>, <em>\q\send\e\rd</em> etc</td>
<td>Usual: <em>bis\q\pek\e\rd</em>, <em>\q\cute</em>, <em>\q\send\e\rd</em> etc</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>Initially § 5</td>
<td>Once: thurh</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medially § 5</td>
<td>Rare: lothe, methes and sathanas (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 Remark)</td>
<td>Twice: sathanas (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 Remark)</td>
<td>Only in sathanas (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 Remark)</td>
<td>Only in sathanas (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 Remark)</td>
<td>Twice: sathanas (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 Remark)</td>
<td>Only in sathanas (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 Remark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finally § 5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once: pith</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d for ð § 7</td>
<td>Rare: folged, haued, bed and ileued</td>
<td>Rare: card, uneade and bernd</td>
<td>Occasional: darf, aider, vnnde, det, deade, dead and eade</td>
<td>Once: ladliche</td>
<td>Regular: my's liked, bi hoted, haued etc</td>
<td>Once: lodliche</td>
<td>Twice: lodliche and darf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t for ð § 8</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally in low stress positions: þinchet, hauet, seìt, et lete and þunchet</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally in low stress positions: þinchet, mis lichet, for ætet etc</td>
<td>Once showing assimilation of þ. of þ.</td>
<td>Frequent in low stress positions: þinchet, det, pillet, habbet etc</td>
<td>Once showing assimilation of þ. of þ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(h) for (\text{th})</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Twice: (\text{th}) and (\text{pth})</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Twice: (\text{th}) and (\text{uth})</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p / w)</td>
<td>Nearly always (p), with rare (w): mowe, owen, wið, were (twice), wiue, drawen (twice), meward, wið and sowle</td>
<td>Nearly always (p), with (w) written once: swicen</td>
<td>The runic letter (p) (wynn) is retained throughout, with occasional examples of (w): wið, hwile, iwisse, wened, wolde, wealdie, worke, swo, willde, wreccche, hwere, hwet and we</td>
<td>Always (p)</td>
<td>The runic letter (p) (wynn) is retained throughout, with only one example of (w): wilde</td>
<td>Nearly always (w), with the runic letter (p) (wynn) only found once: pory</td>
<td>The runic letter (p) (wynn) is retained throughout, with only three examples of (w): yswynch, we and wode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English (æ)</td>
<td>Rare: mæi, ængles, ænes, middenærd, lete and sæd</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Regularly found: æm, pæde, ðæd, ær etc</td>
<td>Occasionally found: æm, þenne, þæs etc</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tironian nota (\text{þ})</td>
<td>Nearly always (\text{þ}), with (\text{and}) written twice</td>
<td>Nearly always (\text{þ}), with (\text{and}) written on three occasions</td>
<td>Always (\text{þ})</td>
<td>Nearly always (\text{þ}), with (\text{and}) written on eight occasions</td>
<td>Nearly always (\text{þ}), with (\text{and}) being (\text{w}) written occasionally (sixteen times)</td>
<td>Mostly (\text{and}) (122 times), with (\text{þ}) written 68 times</td>
<td>Nearly always (\text{þ}), with (\text{and}) written only once</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE velar c before front vowels § 16</td>
<td>Usually k: king(e)/kinges, ke(ðe), kenne(s) c: cudde</td>
<td>Always k: king(e)/kinges, keðen, keðde etc c: cudde and cunne</td>
<td>Usually c: cuðe, cudde, cunne etc k: king(e)/kinges</td>
<td>Usually c: cuðe, cudde, cunne etc k: king(e)/kinges</td>
<td>Nearly always k: king(e)/kinges, ikud, kunne etc c: cuðe</td>
<td>Nearly always k: king(e)/kinges and kenne(s) c: cuðe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE velar c before back vowels § 17</td>
<td>Always c: cunin, care, cunne(n) etc c: cuðen, cumen/come(n), cum/come etc k: kare, kon, kuðe and kunne</td>
<td>Mostly c: cuðen, cumð, come(n) etc k: kare and kan</td>
<td>Mostly c: cuðen, cuðe, cunð, comeð etc k: kinning, kare and kan</td>
<td>Mostly c: cuðen, cuðe, cunð, comeð etc k: kare and kan</td>
<td>Mostly c: cunin, care, comð etc k: kon and kunne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE velar c before the consonant n § 18</td>
<td>c: cunowed and (i)cnoƿen k: knoƿed and (i)knopen</td>
<td>k: (i)knoped and (i)knapen/ (i)knopen</td>
<td>c: cnoped/ (i)kiped and (i)napen</td>
<td>c: cnoped/ (i)kiped and (i)napen(n)</td>
<td>k: knoweð and (i)knowe</td>
<td>k: knopeð, (i)knope and (bi)knope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE velar c before consonants other than n § 19</td>
<td>Always c: (i)cleped, (bi)clepion, ch, crið etc c: (i)cleped, (bi)clepion, ch, crið, christ, christene and christendom</td>
<td>Always c: (i)cleped, (bi)clepion and ch, crið, ch, christ, christene and christendom</td>
<td>Always c: (i)clepede, ch, crið etc Always c: (i)clepede, ch, crið etc</td>
<td>Always c: (i)clepede, ch, crið etc</td>
<td>Always c: (i)cleped, (bi)clepion, crið etc Always c: (i)cleped, (bi)clepion, ch, crið, and crið</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**CONSONANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE cw</td>
<td>§ 20</td>
<td>Always qu: ique me, quike, quenche etc</td>
<td>Always qu: ique me, quike, quenche etc</td>
<td>Mostly qu: ique me, quike, quenche etc</td>
<td>qu: ique me, quike and iquemde</td>
<td>cw: cƿeman and aquenche etc</td>
<td>Always qu: queme, quike, quenche etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE velar c in medial position</td>
<td>§ 21 and § 22</td>
<td>Mostly k: speken, perke, likede etc</td>
<td>Nearly always k: speken(n), perke, likede etc</td>
<td>Once c: godcunnesse (as a result of the compound god + cunnesse)</td>
<td>Nearly always k: speken(n), bi-spikeɗ, siker etc</td>
<td>Rare c: breck and godcunnesse (as a result of the compound god + cunnesse)</td>
<td>Always k: speken, perke, likede etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rare c: misheɗ, bispicaɗ, breck, quica and godcunnesse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c: swicen ch: perche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE velar c in final position</td>
<td>§ 23 and § 24</td>
<td>Always c: ac, fync/fone, loc/lac etc</td>
<td>Nearly always c: fone, lac, perc etc</td>
<td>Always c: ac, ac, fync etc</td>
<td>Always c: ac, ac, fync etc</td>
<td>Nearly always k: ek, werk, bonk etc</td>
<td>Nearly always c: ac, fync, loc etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old English palatal c/tʃ/ in initial position § 28</td>
<td>Always ch: child(e), child(e), chele, chele etc</td>
<td>Always ch: child(e), chele, chele etc</td>
<td>Always ch: child(e), child, chele, chele etc</td>
<td>Always ch: child, childiche, chiche, chele etc</td>
<td>Always ch: child, child, chiche, chele etc</td>
<td>Always ch: child, child, childiche, chiche, chele etc</td>
<td>Always ch: child, child, child, chiche, chele etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English palatal c/tʃ/ in medial position § 29</td>
<td>Always ch: muchel(e), sneche, heueriche etc k, probable /k/ in mukel where palatal /tʃ/ might have been expected</td>
<td>Nearly Always ch: muchel(e), eche, riche etc Once c: hpiče k: snike and hpike where palatal /tʃ/ might have been expected</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: muchel(e), dicles, ponderlicheste etc c: phlice and lichamlice</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: muchel(e), smeche, aquenche/ quenche(n) etc k and ch: sneke and riche, probably /k/ where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: wurche, muchel, riche etc k: smoke, rekʃ and (i)swynk(e) are variants with probable /k/ where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: manyel(e), smeche, lihtlich(e) etc c: luсhek(e) is a variant with probable /k/ where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: teche, muchel, riche etc k: smoke, rekʃ and (i)swynk(e) are variants with probable /k/ where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English palatal c/tʃ/ in final position § 30 and § 31</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: ich, ech/elch, (i)spinch etc c: ic, afric and (i)spinc (the last two are possible variants with /k/)</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: ich, spich, pich etc c: sullic and (i)spinc (these are possible variants with /k/)</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: ich, ech, eurich etc c: ic (this is the more regular reading in D), snice and spinc (the last two are possible variants with /k/)</td>
<td>Mostly ch: smeech, ech, eurich etc Regular c: ic (this is the more regular reading in E2). The variants elc/eure-elc, spich, hpike and sellic are possible readings with /k/</td>
<td>Mostly elch, æfrech, pich etc Occasional c: ic (this is the more regular reading in E1). The variants elc/eure-elc, spich, spilc and pilc are possible readings with /k/</td>
<td>Nearly always ch: ich, such, grümlych etc Once g: drung where palatalization might be expected</td>
<td>Always ch: ich, eurich, smich etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>Digby</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>McClean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEênca and ënca</td>
<td>ch: ënce and ënchen and ënchen</td>
<td>ch: ënchen and ënchen</td>
<td>ch: ënchen and ënchen</td>
<td>ch: ënche and ënche</td>
<td>ch: ënchen and ënchen</td>
<td>ch: ënchen and ënchen</td>
<td>ch: ënche and ënche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 32</td>
<td>(a) ënke and ënke is probably a variant with /k/</td>
<td>Palatalization is found in ëngh and ënchp.</td>
<td>ëngh and ëngh also represent likely palatalization</td>
<td>ëngh and ëngh are variants likely with /k/</td>
<td>ëngh and ëngh are variants likely with /k/</td>
<td>ëngh and ëngh are variants likely with /k/</td>
<td>ëngh and ëngh are probably variants with /k/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old English sc/ʃ/ in initial position

§ 35ff

Nearly always sc: sal, syrreue, sop etc
sc: scrench and scat

Mostly sc: scal, scop, scæat etc
s: solde, (bi) sunien and sal
sch: schal.

Always sc: scal, scop, scæat etc

Mostly sc: scal, serreue, scop etc
sc: scal, scæat, scet and secrud sch: schame\ð| sh: shikde

Nearly always sc: scal, serreue, schop etc

Once sc: scolden

Nearly always writes sc: scilde, scal, scerreue etc

Once sch: schat

Old English sc/ʃ/ in medial position

§ 38

ss: fisces

ss: fisces

sc: fisces

s: fisces

s: fîsses

ss: fîsses

Old English sc/ʃ/ in final position

§ 39

sc: uersc

s: fis

sc: fisces

s: fisces

sc: fisces

s: fisces

s: fîsses

sh: fish
## CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE [ts]</td>
<td>Usually c: <em>milce</em> Once ch: <em>mikhe</em></td>
<td>Always c: <em>mike</em></td>
<td>Always c: <em>mike</em></td>
<td>Always c: <em>mike</em></td>
<td>Always c: <em>mike</em></td>
<td>Always c: <em>mylkce</em></td>
<td>Always s: <em>milse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE /g/ in initial position</td>
<td>Before a consonant it is g: <em>grameð, grende, glede</em> etc Before the OE back-vowels <em>a, o, u</em> it is g: god, gulte, golde etc By levelling it is g in (<em>bi</em>)ginnigge</td>
<td>Before a consonant it is g: <em>grameð, grunde, glede</em> etc Before the OE back-vowels <em>a, o, u</em> it is g: god, gulte, golde etc By levelling it is g in (<em>bi</em>)ginnigge and gate</td>
<td>Before a consonant it is g: <em>grameð, grunde, glede</em> etc Before the OE back-vowels <em>a, o, u</em> it is g: god, gulte, go etc By levelling it is g in (<em>bi</em>)ginnigge</td>
<td>Before a consonant it is g: <em>gramet, grunde, glede</em> etc Before the OE back-vowels <em>a, o, u</em> it is g: god, gulte, go etc By levelling it is g in (<em>bi</em>)ginnigge</td>
<td>Before a consonant it is g: <em>grimlych, grunde, grýslé</em> etc Before the OE back-vowels <em>a, o, u</em> it is g: god, agulte, go etc By levelling it is g in (<em>bi</em>)gyñýnge</td>
<td>Before a consonant it is g: <em>grameð, grunde, glede</em> etc Before the OE back-vowels <em>a, o, u</em> it is g: (<em>holi</em>) gostes, god, gulte etc By levelling it is g in ginnigge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The OE fricative ( /\gamma/ ) § 43</td>
<td>Mostly ( \gamma ): folged, ogen, lagge etc</td>
<td>Nearly always ( \gamma ): muge, agen, dragen etc.</td>
<td>Always ( \gamma ): volged, haged, lagge etc</td>
<td>Nearly always ( \gamma ): folged, muge, agen etc ( \gamma ): moghe</td>
<td>Mixed ( p ) and ( \gamma ): dragen, hope, mouge and moge, agen, lagges etc</td>
<td>Always ( w ): folowed( \gamma ), mowe, owe etc</td>
<td>Always ( \gamma ): moge, oge( e ), drage etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Palatal ( ʒ /\j/ ) in initial position § 45</td>
<td>Nearly always ( ʒ ): giet, geunge, foreget etc ( i ) before /u/ in jung (see § 45.1)</td>
<td>Always ( ʒ ): ung, get, geunge etc ( g ) Gue (see § 45.2 and Comment)</td>
<td>Always ( ʒ ): ʒung, ʒiet, vorget etc</td>
<td>Always ( ʒ ): ʒung, ʒuet, forget etc</td>
<td>Nearly always ( y ): yong, yet, for-yet etc but plosive /g/ in vn-for-gulde (see § 45.3 and Comment)</td>
<td>Always ( ʒ ): ʒung, ʒet, worget etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial ( \gamma ) is retained before ( i ) in ( gief )</td>
<td>Initial ( \gamma ) is retained before ( i ) in ( gief/gief/ ( ʒ ) but ( g ) in Gif (see Comment to § 45.4)</td>
<td>Initial ( \gamma ) is lost before ( i ) in ( ef )</td>
<td>Initial ( \gamma ) is retained before ( i ) in ( gief/gief )</td>
<td>Initial ( \gamma ) is retained before ( i ) in ( gief ) but ( g ) in Gif (see Comment to § 45.4)</td>
<td>Initial ( y ) is usually omitted in ( i ) but is found once in ( jef )</td>
<td>Initial ( ʒ ) is retained before ( i ) in ( ʒef )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʒ after a front vowel but before a back vowel § 47</td>
<td>Nearly always demonstrates transition to a palatal through the writing of ɪ: eien, forƿreien, iseien and niseien ʒ retained in peigen (the writing of ʒ does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound)</td>
<td>More often ʒ retained: egen, nisegen and isege in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound ʒh in egen (the writing of ʒ in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of ɪ: peien and forƿreien</td>
<td>Mostly ʒ: pege, and isege and ʒh in egen (the writing of ʒ in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of ɪ: forƿreien</td>
<td>Always ʒ: egen, pegen and segen (the writing of ʒ in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of ɪ: forƿreien and ae-i-seien</td>
<td>More often ʒ: egen, pegen and segen (the writing of ʒ in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of ɪ: forƿreien and ae-i-seien</td>
<td>Always ẏ, demonstrating Transition to a palatal sound: eyn, weyn, for-preye etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatal ʒ following a parasitic vowel § 48</td>
<td>–ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and eadi</td>
<td>–ʒ is ɪ: eni, moni and edh but ʒ is written in amige</td>
<td>–ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and edh</td>
<td>–ʒ is ɪ: eni, moni and edh</td>
<td>–ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and edh</td>
<td>–ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and edh</td>
<td>–ʒ is ɪ: holi, ani, mani etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Palatal ʒ following a parasitic vowel § 48: –ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and eadi –ʒ is ɪ: eni, moni and edh but ʒ is written in amige –ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and edh –ʒ is ɪ: eni, moni and edh –ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and edh –ʒ is ɪ: ani, mani and edh –ʒ is ɪ: holi, ani, mani etc
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>loss of palatal ʒ /j/ before d</td>
<td>Lost before d in sede; and seden; vocalized to /i/ in isaid and ileid</td>
<td>Lost before d in sede; more regularly vocalized to /i/ in isaid and ileid</td>
<td>Lost before d: sede(n) but vocalized to /i/ in ileid</td>
<td>Lost before d: sede and ised but vocalized to /i/ in y-leid</td>
<td>Lost before d: sede and ised but vocalized to /i/ in y-leid</td>
<td>Always vocalized to /i/ before d: seýde, sede and seýden and r-leyd</td>
<td>Lost before d in sede but is more regularly vocalized to /i/ in sede and ileid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE palatal gg /dz/</td>
<td>Frankish gg: bugge and seggen g: abuged, liged and leged</td>
<td>Frankish gg: bugge, seggen and liged</td>
<td>Frankish gg: bugge, seggen and liged</td>
<td>Frankish gg: bugge, seggen, ligget etc</td>
<td>Frankish gg: bugge, seggen, ligget etc</td>
<td>Frankish gg: bugge, sigge and legged</td>
<td>Frankish gg: bugge, sigge and legged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE g in the group nʒ/ng/</td>
<td>Mostly ng: longe, kinge, strengde, prongpise etc Devoicing to /ŋk/ before d is found in strenchde, and to /ŋ/ before p in prongpise</td>
<td>Mostly ng: longe, longe, kinge, giuong etc Devoicing to /ŋk/ before d is found in meind n absent in biginigge</td>
<td>Nearly always ng: longe, kinge, giuong etc Devoicing to /ŋk/ written nc, before d in strenchde and before p in prongpise/prongpise n absent in bi-ginigge</td>
<td>Mostly ng: lange, lange/lange, kinge, strengde/e etc Devoicing to /ŋk/ written nc, before d in strenchde and before p in prongpise/prongpise n absent in bi-ginigge</td>
<td>Nearly always ng: lange/lange, kinge, yong, wrongwise etc Devoicing to /ŋk/ before d in meynd</td>
<td>Mostly ng: lange/lange, pronge, kinge, reuing etc Devoicing to /ŋk/, written nc before d in sycn</td>
<td>Mostly ng: lange/lange, pronge, kinge, reuing etc Devoicing to /ŋk/ written nc before d in sycn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE /h/ initially and before a vowel § 52</td>
<td>Always retained: habbe, horde, his etc</td>
<td>Mostly retained: <em>habbe, (child)-hade, (i)̂hude etc</em></td>
<td>Always retained: habbe, horde, his etc</td>
<td>Always retained: habbe, horde, his etc</td>
<td>Mostly retained: habbe, horde, his etc</td>
<td>Not found in <em>vnger</em></td>
<td>Always retained: <em>holi-gostes, helpen, habbe etc</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The OE weak neuter <em>pron. hit</em> is always <em>hit</em></td>
<td>The OE weak neuter <em>pron. hit</em> is always <em>hit</em></td>
<td>The OE weak neuter <em>pron. hit</em> is always <em>hit</em></td>
<td>The OE weak neuter <em>pron. hit</em> is almost <em>hit</em> with occasional <em>hit</em></td>
<td>The OE weak neuter <em>pron. hit</em> is most often <em>hit</em> with occasional <em>hit</em></td>
<td>The OE weak neuter <em>pron. hit</em> is almost <em>hit</em> with occasional <em>hit</em></td>
<td>The OE weak neuter <em>pron. hit</em> is almost <em>hit</em> with occasional <em>hit</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE /h/ is added initially in <em>horpe</em></td>
<td><em>h</em> is added initially in: <em>heke, hechte, hogede, hogen, herre</em></td>
<td><em>h</em> is added initially in: <em>heke, hechte, hogede, hogen, herre</em></td>
<td><em>h</em> is added initially in: <em>heueninges and hope</em></td>
<td><em>h</em> is added initially in: <em>heueninges and hope</em></td>
<td><em>h</em> is added initially in: <em>heueninges and hope</em></td>
<td><em>h</em> is added initially in: <em>heueninges and hope</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE /h/ initially and before the consonant <em>l, n</em> and <em>r</em> § 53</td>
<td>Mostly without <em>h</em>: repen, louerd, raðer, <em>h</em> retained: hliesten/histe (both in rhyming position)</td>
<td>Always without <em>h</em>: repen, lauerd, raðer, <em>h</em> retained: hliesten (in rhyming position)</td>
<td>Nearly always without <em>h</em>: riepe/repen, louerd, raðer <em>h</em> retained: hliesten (in rhyming position)</td>
<td>Without <em>h</em>: rupon/repe, lauerd/lauerd, raðe, <em>h</em> retained: hlauord (twice), hlusten</td>
<td>Always without <em>h</em>: rupon/repe, lauerd/lauerd, raðer, <em>h</em> retained: hlauord (twice), hlusten</td>
<td>Always without <em>h</em>: rupon/repe, lauerd/lauerd, raðer, <em>h</em> retained: hlauord (twice), hlusten</td>
<td>Always without <em>h</em>: rupon/repe, lauerd/lauerd, raðer, <em>h</em> retained: hlauord (twice), hlusten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE /h/ initially and before the consonant w</td>
<td>Nearly always hp: hpile, hpet/hpet, hpere etc. Once ph: phile</td>
<td>More often hp: hpile, hpet/hpet, hpere etc. Written without p in hom. Regularly written without h. penne, pet/pat, pa-se etc.</td>
<td>Mostly hw/hp, hpile, hpet/hpet/hpet, hpere etc. Without h. pile (regularly) and pat.</td>
<td>Mostly hp: hpenne, hpile, hpet etc. ph: phet, phecer, philce, pheker and phen.</td>
<td>Mostly without hs: pyle/pile, pat/pet, par etc. hp: hpile, hpet/hpet, hpsi, hpa-se, hpeker and essa/hpere.</td>
<td>Nearly always hw: hwenne, hwile, hwat etc. Once wh: whon.</td>
<td>Nearly always ph: pheane/phanne, phat, phile etc. hw: huat and huiche.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing of h in the combination ht</td>
<td>ht is always retained: mihte, ahte, unboht etc.</td>
<td>Mostly ht: nvboht, rihtpesnesse, brihte etc. Regular cht: eghte, ehegte and eghte. ch: ticrete. tdt: egete and bikagte (from Old Northern French cachier) h0h0p: iishte and isihtke (from OE sih4).</td>
<td>Mostly ht: tvboht, rihtpesnesse, brihte etc. Regular cht: eghte, ehegte and eghte. ch: ticrete. tdt: egete and bikagte (from Old Northern French cachier) h0h0p: iishte and isihtke (from OE sih4).</td>
<td>ht is almost always retained: nihte, ehte, un-boht etc. ft. of-ðuhte.</td>
<td>Mostly ht: ehte, mihte, nihte etc. Omission of h: nout, nopyt, vn-bout. ridtinesse tt: britte, dritte, ut-broutte tht: drotch, lichte, mithen etc: ekete.</td>
<td>ht is almost always retained: myhte, ayyhte, vn-bouth etc. ght: nought (twice).</td>
<td>Always ȝt: mizhte, dȝte, (un)pizte etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The velar fricative \[\text{x}\] and the palatal fricative \[\text{s}\] in final position § 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The velar fricative [\text{x}] and the palatal fricative [\text{s}] in final position</td>
<td>[\text{th}, \text{th}, \text{i-\text{seh}, \text{i-noh, \text{ch}, \text{\textit{pech}, \text{\textit{purch}}}}]</td>
<td>[\text{th}, \text{\textit{purch}, \text{\textit{pech}} and \text{\textit{i-seh}}]</td>
<td>[\text{th}, \text{\textit{purch} and \text{\textit{i-noh, \text{ch}, \text{\textit{purch}}}}]</td>
<td>[\text{th}, \text{\textit{ah}, \text{\textit{peh}, \text{\textit{purch}} and \text{\textit{i-seh}}]</td>
<td>[\text{th}, \text{\textit{ah}, \text{\textit{purch}, \text{\textit{i-noh, \text{ch}, \text{\textit{purch}}}}]</td>
<td>[\text{\textit{he} and \text{\textit{he}}]</td>
<td>[\text{\textit{he} and \text{\textit{he}}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before final \(-\text{e, without } /\text{s}/\) in \text{heie} |

The OE Prefix \text{ge} § 57

| | Retained on two occasions: \text{ge-\text{lobe} and ge-\text{seafte}} | Retained on four occasions: \text{ge-\text{lad}, ge-spynch/ ge-spinch, ge-\text{lobe}} | |
| | \[\text{ge-\text{lobe} and ge-\text{seafte}}\] | \[\text{ge-\text{lad}, ge-spynch/ ge-spinch, ge-\text{lobe}}\] | |
### VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OE ə in open syllables</strong></td>
<td>Always ə: habben, fare, naude etc</td>
<td>Always ə: habbe, faren, bæien etc</td>
<td>Always ə: habbe, varen, bæien etc</td>
<td>Always ə: habbe, faren, bæien etc</td>
<td>Always ə: habbe, varen, naueb etc</td>
<td>Always ə: habbe, vare, naueb etc</td>
<td>Always ə: habbe, fare, naueb etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OE ə before a nasal</strong></td>
<td>Always ə: man, þan, þanne etc</td>
<td>Mostly ə: mon, moni, þonke etc ə: þanke, þanne and monke</td>
<td>Mostly ə: man, þan, þan, þanne etc</td>
<td>Always ə: manne, þan, þanne etc</td>
<td>Always ə: man, þan, þanne etc</td>
<td>Mostly ə: mon, moni, þonke etc ə: þanke and þonc</td>
<td>Mostly ə: man, þan, þanne etc ə: þanke and þonc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OE ə before a lengthening group</strong></td>
<td>Nearly always ə: longe, pronge, honde etc ə: hange(ə) (see § 61).</td>
<td>Mostly ə: longe, pronge, honde etc ə: prange and prangepise.</td>
<td>Always ə: longe, pronge, honde etc</td>
<td>Always ə: lange, prange, hande etc</td>
<td>Mostly ə: longe, strong(e), honde etc ə: lange, hanged and prange.</td>
<td>Always ə: lange, wronge, honde etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always ə: lange, strong(e), honde ə: lange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OE ə</strong></td>
<td>Mostly ə: habbe, after, patere/pater etc ə: sad e: hpeðer</td>
<td>Mostly ə: hefde, e[θ], elnesse etc ə: habbe/abbe, patere/pater, hpat, lader and bæ</td>
<td>Mostly ə: hedde, elnesse, after etc ə: habbe(n), hadde, pater, hpat and vader/ader</td>
<td>Mostly ə: heðe, elmesse, after(e) etc Occasional ə: habbe/abbe, hat(ə), and hadde ə: after and bæ</td>
<td>Mostly ə: habbe, elmesse, after etc Occasional e after, pet/hpet, peder, sed ea once: bead</td>
<td>Mostly ə: habbe, almes/almesse, after etc Occasional e heude, hedde, brek and hweðer</td>
<td>Always ə: habbe, patere(s), phat etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE e</td>
<td>§ 64</td>
<td>Nearly always e: beren, ende, felde, strenge/strenghe etc</td>
<td>Nearly always e: beren, ende, strenghe etc</td>
<td>Always e: beren, ende, felde, strenge/strenghe etc</td>
<td>Nearly always e: beren, ende, strenghe etc</td>
<td>Nearly always e: beren, ende, strenghe etc</td>
<td>Nearly always e: beren, ende, strenghe etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a: angles² (probably influenced by OF anglene, angle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OE o | § 65    | Nearly always o: bifore/biforen, bode, nolde etc | More often o: biforen, bode, nolden etc | Always o: biøere, bode, borde etc | Always o: before, bode, borde etc | Always o: biøere, bode, borde etc | Always o: bifore, bode, nolde etc |
|      |         | a: sørge |       |    |    |       |         |
### VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ı</td>
<td>Mostly ı bidden, child, finde(n) etc</td>
<td>Mostly ı bidden, child/child(e), finde(n) etc</td>
<td>Nearly always ı bide, child(e), finde etc</td>
<td>Mostly ı bidde, child(e), finde(n) etc</td>
<td>Mostly ı bidde, child(e), finde(n) etc</td>
<td>Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 66</td>
<td>u: pule, ospreng and spunche (for influence of w § 66.4)</td>
<td>u: pule, pule, pulle (for the influence of w § 66.4)</td>
<td>e: ospreng (for neutralizing to ı § 66.3)</td>
<td>e: ospreng (for neutralizing to ı § 66.3)</td>
<td>e: ospreng (for neutralizing to ı § 66.3)</td>
<td>e: ospreng (for neutralizing to ı § 66.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:</td>
<td>The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:</td>
<td>The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:</td>
<td>The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:</td>
<td>The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:</td>
<td>The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nele, nelle, nelse and nesten</td>
<td>nele, nelle, nelse and nesten</td>
<td>nele, nelle and nesten</td>
<td>nele, nelle, nelse and nesten</td>
<td>nele, nelle, nelse and nesten</td>
<td>nele, nelle and nesten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly always ı bide, child(e), finde etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle and nesten
- nute and nusten

Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle, nelse and nesten
- nute and nusten

Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle, nelse and nesten
- nute and nusten

Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle, nelse and nesten
- nute and nusten

Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle, nelse and nesten
- nute and nusten

Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle, nelse and nesten
- nute and nusten

Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle, nelse and nesten
- nute and nusten

Mostly ı biden, child(e), finde(n) etc.

The neg. forms of OE willan and witan (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are:

- nele, nelle, nelse and nesten
- nute and nusten
## VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE y</td>
<td>§ 67</td>
<td>A mixture of u and e: dude, ē punche, gulte etc and deden, euel, sene etc. i: ē punche, ē pincéd, king(e)s, hþilch and before h in drihte(n) and tihte</td>
<td>Mostly u: dude, gulte, muchel etc Regular ē ē pincéd, ē afirst, king etc ē dede and (vn)net</td>
<td>Mostly e: dede, (vn)net, ē pincén etc u: muchel(e) /muchel and sunegedēn Regular ē: ē pincéd, ē king(e), ē afirst etc</td>
<td>Mostly u: dude, gulte, muchel(e) etc. Regular i: ē ē pincē(n), ē king(e)s, spilc, etc ē deden, euel(e), a-lirst, ṽēnchēā and lest.</td>
<td>Mostly u: dude, ē punchen, agult etc Regular ē: ē ē pincē(n), ē king(e)s, spilc, etc ē deden, euel(e), a-lirst, ṽēnchēā and lest.</td>
<td>A mixture of u and e: dude, gulte, muchel etc and misdedē, (vn)net, ē pincē(n) etc Regular ē and ē ē pincē(n), ē king(e)s, a-virst, ē king(e)ā/kyng etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE y′</td>
<td>§ 67</td>
<td>u: hudden, fur(e) and cudden i: litel/līte and hpi e: here and kōdē</td>
<td>Mostly u: lutel, ihud, fur(e), cūdē and kūdē i: litel/līte and hpi</td>
<td>e: fere/ver, kōdē and kēdē ē: litel/līte, hidden and hpi</td>
<td>u: lutel, lute, hud, fur(e), cūfe and cudde ē: litel, litel and hpi</td>
<td>u: lutel, hud, fur(e), cūfe and cudde ē: litel and hpi.</td>
<td>Nearly always u: lutel/lute, ihud, fur(e), cūfe and cudde ē: litel and hpi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE u</td>
<td>§ 68</td>
<td>Always u: cume(n), punien, grunde etc</td>
<td>Nearly always u: cume(n), punien, grunde etc. and cume(n), ponien, iponed etc</td>
<td>A mixture of u and a: cume(n), punien, grunde etc. and cume(n), ponien, iponed etc</td>
<td>Always u: cume(n), punien, grunde etc a: always in the verb cume(n), comed etc.</td>
<td>Mostly u: punien, grunde, sun etc. a: always in the verb cume(n), comed etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always u: cume(n), punien, grunde etc. a: sone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ā</td>
<td>Mostly α lore, one, non etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) a: aquerne, bihat (cont.), hatere and hat (cont.)</td>
<td>Nearly always α: lore, one, non etc α: pori</td>
<td>Nearly always α: lore, one, non etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) a: nammore and bihat (cont.)</td>
<td>Nearly always α: ane, nan, lac etc α: pori</td>
<td>More often α: lore, one, non etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff)</td>
<td>Mostly α: lore, one, non etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) a: nammore, aquerne, bihat (cont.), hatter and hat (cont.)</td>
<td>Nearly always α: lore, one, non etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE æ</td>
<td>Mostly α: dade, rade, ofdrade etc. α: late e: iselā, unsele and mere</td>
<td>Nearly always e: dade, rede, adrede etc α: lathe</td>
<td>Nearly always e: dade, rede, adrede etc α: naddren</td>
<td>Nearly always e: dade, rede, adrede etc α: forlate</td>
<td>Mostly e: dade, rede, adrede etc α: vnisaře, adrade, ofdrad/of-drard and naddren α: lische ex: un-seleře</td>
<td>Always e: dade, rede, adrede etc</td>
<td>Always e: dade, rede, adrede etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Æ</td>
<td>Mostly α: mast, ar/are, unhalā etc α: ares ea: hease e: mene and hete</td>
<td>Nearly always: est, un-helāe, lest etc α: anianie and an- man</td>
<td>Nearly always e: mest, unhelāe, lest etc α: ari/anie and ari- man</td>
<td>Mostly e: mest, unhelāe, lest etc α: ari/anie and ari- man Regularly α: ar, æ urich, æure, æura-ma, ilded, lade/hedun and ænman</td>
<td>Mostly e: mest, unhelāe, lest etc α: ari/anie and ari- man Regularly α: ar, æ urich, æure, æura-ma, ilded, lade/hedun and ænman</td>
<td>Nearlly always e: mest, vnheře, lept etc α: ear ex: ear</td>
<td>Mostly e: mest, vnheře, lest etc α: ilad, ladde and ani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Trinity</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
<th>Digby</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>McClean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ē</td>
<td>Always ē, he, deh/ded, iqueme etc (the writing of deh in D is by analogy and the writing of hi in D is the pl. form written for the sg.).</td>
<td>Always ē, he, deh/ded, iqueme etc</td>
<td>Always ē, he, deh/ded, iqueme etc</td>
<td>Nearly always ē, he, deh/ded, iqueme etc</td>
<td>Always ē, he, deh/ded, iqueme etc</td>
<td>Always ē, he, deh/ded, iqueme etc</td>
<td>Always ē, he, deh/ded, iqueme etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ī</td>
<td>Always ī, mine, briste, hpile etc</td>
<td>Always ī, mi, briste, hpile etc</td>
<td>Always ī, mi, hpile, briste etc</td>
<td>Almost always ī, mi, hpile, briste etc</td>
<td>Always ī, mi, hpile, briste etc</td>
<td>Always ī/ŷ: myr, briste, hpile/hwi etc</td>
<td>Always ī, mi, briste, hpile/hwi etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ō</td>
<td>Always ō, to, dome, boc etc (the writing of cam in T is by analogy)</td>
<td>Always ō, to, dom(e), boc etc</td>
<td>Always ō, to, dom(e), boc etc</td>
<td>Always ō, to, dom(e), boc etc</td>
<td>Always ō, to, dom(e), boc etc</td>
<td>Always ō, to, dome, boc etc</td>
<td>Always ō, to, dome, boc etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ū</td>
<td>Always ū, nu, ure, ū etc</td>
<td>Always ū, nu, ure/vre, ū etc</td>
<td>Always ū, nu, ure/vre, ū etc</td>
<td>Always ū, nu, ure/vre, ū etc</td>
<td>Always ū, nu, ure/vre, ū etc</td>
<td>Always ū, nu, ure/vre, ū etc</td>
<td>Always ū, nu, ure/vre, ū etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>LAMBETH</td>
<td>DIGBY</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>JESUS</td>
<td>McCLEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ea before r-combinations § 87ff</td>
<td>Without lengthening it is always a: <em>arge</em>, <em>arf, arme etc</em></td>
<td>Without lengthening it is regularly e: <em>arge</em> and <em>arf, arme etc</em></td>
<td>Without lengthening it is always a: <em>arge</em>, <em>arf, arme etc</em></td>
<td>Without lengthening it is regularly a: <em>arge</em>, <em>narepe, arme</em> and <em>arf, arme etc</em></td>
<td>Without lengthening it is nearly always a: <em>arf, arme, swarte and narewe</em></td>
<td>Without lengthening it is nearly always a: <em>arf, arme, swarte and narepe</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before rd it is nearly always a: <em>arde, herde and hernde</em></td>
<td>Before rd it is always a: <em>(middel)erd/e</em>, <em>arde and hernde</em></td>
<td>Before rd it is nearly always a: <em>arde, herde and (middel)erd ex: (middelen)eard</em></td>
<td>Before rd it is nearly always e: <em>arde, herde and spierde</em></td>
<td>Before rd it is more regularly e: <em>erde and (middel)erd ex: (middelen)eard</em></td>
<td>Before rd a: <em>arde, herde and (middel)erd ex: (middelen)eard</em></td>
<td>Before rd a: <em>erde and (middel)erd</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before r n it is e: <em>erninge and persin a: parni</em></td>
<td>Before r n a: <em>parni</em> e: <em>erninge</em></td>
<td>Before r n it is e: <em>(middelen)eard</em></td>
<td>Before r n it is e: <em>erninge</em></td>
<td>Before r n it is e: <em>parni and parnie e: erninge</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-umaut of ea before r-combinations § 89ff</td>
<td>e: derne and erming <em>ie smierte</em></td>
<td>e: derne <em>ie: smierte</em></td>
<td>e: <em>arminges</em> e: smerte <em>ie: dierne</em></td>
<td>e: <em>erninges</em> u: <em>durne ex: smeorte</em></td>
<td>e: derne <em>ie: earnýnges</em></td>
<td>e: <em>smerte and ernigges</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOWELS</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ea before l, without lengthening (Anglian a)</td>
<td>Always a: al and alle, falle, palles etc</td>
<td>Nearly always a: al and alle, palles etc</td>
<td>Considerable variation. More often ea: ealle and ealle, peak(e) etc</td>
<td>Mostly a: al and alle, falle, palles etc</td>
<td>Always a: al and alle, falle, palles etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ea before ld</td>
<td>Mostly ea: peald(e), eald(e) etc</td>
<td>Mostly a: palde, aald, fald(e) etc</td>
<td>A mixture of ia and ea, with occasional a: palde, hialde and hialde; wealden, eald(e) etc; alde and hald.</td>
<td>Regularly ea: pealden, eald(e), teald(e) etc</td>
<td>Some variance. Regularly ea: pealden, eald(e), teald(e) etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-umlaut of ea before l combinations (Angli. mutation of a)</td>
<td>Mostly e: elder and elde</td>
<td>e: alde</td>
<td>e: elder/eldre and held(e)</td>
<td>e: elder/eldre and elde</td>
<td>Mostly e: elder/eldre and elde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 90

§ 91ff

§ 92ff
### VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ea before h combinations</td>
<td>ie heie and iisih</td>
<td>e iiseh</td>
<td>e hei and iisih</td>
<td>e hei and iisih</td>
<td>e hei, heige and sei e heige</td>
<td>ey heye and iiseyh</td>
<td>e heye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-umlaut of ea before h-combinations</td>
<td>i: mihte(n) and nihte</td>
<td>i: mihte(n)/michte and nihte</td>
<td>i: mihte(n) and nihte</td>
<td>i: mihte(n) and nihte(s)</td>
<td>i: y: myhte/ mihte(n) and nihte(s)</td>
<td>y: y: myhte(n)/ mihte and nihte(s)</td>
<td>i: mihte(n) and nihte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE eo before r-combinations</td>
<td>Mostly e perk/eperc, perkes and herte</td>
<td>Mostly e perk/perch, perkes and herte</td>
<td>e per, perkes, sterre and herte</td>
<td>Always eo peorch(e)/perc, peorches, heirte and storerre</td>
<td>e perche/percand perkes eo: peorches, heirte and storerre</td>
<td>e: werk and werkes eo: hearthe and storerre</td>
<td>e: perk, porke/pork, porkes and herte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 96ff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>war group § 97</td>
<td>u: purde and purde</td>
<td>u: purde and purde</td>
<td>u: purde</td>
<td>u: purde</td>
<td>u: purde</td>
<td>u: purde</td>
<td>u: purpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The i-umlaut of eo is e: perest and pers(e)</td>
<td>The i-umlaut of eo is u: purst and purs(e)</td>
<td>The i-umlaut of eo is e: pers(e)</td>
<td>The i-umlaut of eo is u: purst(e)</td>
<td>The i-umlaut of eo is u: purse</td>
<td>The i-umlaut of eo is u: wurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE eo before l- combinations § 98</td>
<td>Always e: self and selfe(n)</td>
<td>Always e: selue/self</td>
<td>Mostly u: sulne/sulue/self</td>
<td>A mixture of e and u: selue, selve and selve; sulne/sulne</td>
<td>Always e: selue/selfe</td>
<td>Always e: selue/selfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE eo before ht § 99</td>
<td>Always: unrihtpinesse, unriht, rihte and briht(e)</td>
<td>Always i: rihtpinesse, unriht, rihte and briht(e)</td>
<td>Always i: rihtpinesse, unriht/rihte, rihte and briht(e)</td>
<td>Always i: rihtginesse, unriht, rihte and briht(e)</td>
<td>Always i: rihtweeness, unriht, rihte and briht(e)</td>
<td>Always i: rihtWEENess, rihtWEeness, riht/eht, riht and briht(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-umlaut of eo before h § 100</td>
<td>i: ouer-sih and þurh-sið</td>
<td>i: ouer-sih and þurh-sið</td>
<td>i: þurhsige</td>
<td>i: ouer-sih and þurh-sið</td>
<td>i: ouer-sih and þurh-sið</td>
<td>y: ouer-siyb and þurh-siyb</td>
<td>i: ouersih and þurh-sið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verb OE eom, eam, am § 101</td>
<td>eom is am</td>
<td>eom is em</td>
<td>eom is am</td>
<td>eom is aem and eom</td>
<td>eom is aem and eom</td>
<td>eom is am</td>
<td>eom is am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE eo (æ-umlaut of e)</td>
<td>Always e. fele, breke, pele and unfremu</td>
<td>Regularly æ. fele, breke, unfræne e. fele and pele</td>
<td>Always e. vele/uele/fele, breke and pele</td>
<td>Mostly æ. fele/uele, breke, and pele e. fele (possibly by association with the antonym fæawe § 103.8)</td>
<td>Mostly æ. fele/vele, breke, and pele e. fele (possibly by association with the antonym fæawe § 103.8)</td>
<td>Regularly æ. vele/uele/fele and wele e. vele and breke</td>
<td>Always e. vele/uele/fele, breke, unfreman and pele/pel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 102 and § 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE eo (u-umlaut of e)</td>
<td>Almost always e. heuen(e), heueriche, pereld(es) etc. u: suster and pude (written under the influence of w)</td>
<td>Regularly æ. heuen(e), heueriche, pereld(es) e. heuen u: suster (written under the influence of w)</td>
<td>Mostly æ. heuen(e), heueriche, heuenliche etc. æ. porle/porle and purlde and pude u: suster (written under the influence of w)</td>
<td>Regularly æ. heuen(e), heuenliche etc. æ. porle/porle and purlde/purld(e) and pude u: suster (written under the influence of w)</td>
<td>Regularly æ. heuen(e) and heuenliche etc. æ. porle/porle and purlde/purld(e) and pude u: suster (written under the influence of w)</td>
<td>Mostly æ. heuen(e) and heuenliche etc. æ. porle/porle and purlde/purld(e) and pude u: suster (written under the influence of w)</td>
<td>Regularly æ. heuen(e), heuenliche etc. æ. porle/porle and purlde/purld(e) and pude u: suster (written under the influence of w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 102 and § 104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>LAMBETH</td>
<td>DIGBY</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>JESUS</td>
<td>McCLEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar umlaut ıː of i ıː</td>
<td>Mostly eː sed, seune, bineː ben etc</td>
<td>Regularly αː sodden, seune, bineː ben etc</td>
<td>Mostly eː sed, seune, bineː ben etc</td>
<td>Regularly eː sodden, seune, bineː ben etc</td>
<td>Regularly eː bi-neː ben, suer, heore etc</td>
<td>Regularly eː bi-neː ben, suer, heore etc</td>
<td>eː seue, bineː be, selure, henne etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 105</td>
<td>s. sodden, seune, bineː ben etc</td>
<td>iː hire, (be)nime, quike, sibhe and nipher</td>
<td>iː hire, (be)nime, quike, sibhe and nipher</td>
<td>iː (be)nimen and quike</td>
<td>iː (be)nemen and quike</td>
<td>iː (be)nime and quike</td>
<td>iː nipher, (bi)nime, sibhe and quike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From IWS syː dân § 105.3)

iː (be)nimen and quike

Reflect a lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW (IWS syː dân § 105.3)
### Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Trinity</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
<th>Digby</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>McClean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ëa</td>
<td>Regularly ex. estē, desthē, eaddē, eaddē etc.</td>
<td>Mostly e: e, chep, oθē etc.</td>
<td>Mostly a: uneade and deade (both in rhyming position and might reflect a feature of the text being copied)</td>
<td>Mix of e and ex. ec/ce, ec/lede, vnnede, deode/deced, brede/brede and leak, ecke, ecke, unneade, deode/deode, brede and eadi</td>
<td>Mostly e: ec, eθē, deθē etc.</td>
<td>Mostly e: e, che, deθē etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always e: ek/ekē, eθē, deθē/deθē etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 106</td>
<td>e: eke/ekē, vnnēθē, deθē and brede/bred etc.</td>
<td>e: eke/ekē, vnnēθē, deθē and brede/bred etc.</td>
<td>e: eke/ekē, vnnēθē, deθē and brede/bred etc.</td>
<td>e: eke/ekē, vnnēθē, deθē and brede/bred etc.</td>
<td>e: eke/ekē, vnnēθē, deθē and brede/bred etc.</td>
<td>e: eke/ekē, vnnēθē, deθē and brede/bred etc.</td>
<td>e: eke/ekē, vnnēθē, deθē and brede/bred etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë: u:</td>
<td>Always e: ileu(n), hire(n), temen etc.</td>
<td>Always e: ileu(n), alesed, iheren etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always e: ileu(n), alesed, temen etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always u: ilu(u)th, ihuren and ilus(e)</td>
<td>Nearly always u: i-</td>
<td>Always e: ileu(n), here, teme etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always e: ylu(θ), teme, ilesed and leu(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 107</td>
<td>Always e: ileu(n), hire(n), temen etc.</td>
<td>Always e: ileu(n), alesed, iheren etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always e: ileu(n), alesed, temen etc.</td>
<td>e: ileu(n), leuθ and temen (only written in rhyming position and, therefore, an unlikely representation of the dialect)</td>
<td>Nearly always u: i-</td>
<td>Always e: ileu(n), here, teme etc.</td>
<td>Nearly always e: ylu(θ), teme, ilesed and leu(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>LAMBETH</td>
<td>DIGBY</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>JESUS</td>
<td>McCLEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§108</td>
<td>OE ēo</td>
<td>A mixture of e and ie: be/ben, lef, frend etc and bien, lief, friend etc</td>
<td>Mostly a mixture of eo and α: ben/ben, son, frend etc and beo, seon, freond etc i: bið e se and tening</td>
<td>A mixture of i and ie written alongside e and occasional eo and α: bi, bien, isen, lief etc and ben, frend, isen etc with isen, deoflen and dofles</td>
<td>Mostly eo beo(n), seon, freond etc e: ben ie: lief i: sic</td>
<td>Retains eo, o, u and u forms, alongside unrounded e eo, o, u and u beo/beo, seon, freond etc; buen and bue, bud/bud, bo and frond e: ben/be, isen, leure etc i: lif and sic</td>
<td>Mostly eo beo(n), seon, leof etc e: be, leue and sek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§109</td>
<td>i-umlaut of ēo</td>
<td>Mostly ie: friend, frien,̄ fiesternesse etc e: frend and derlings u: þuster (possibly from WS y (§109.2) but also possibly representing /u:/ from ēo)</td>
<td>Nearly always α: freond, dore, node and diere eo: deorlings and feond e: frend</td>
<td>Mostly ie: þestre, fiesternesse, nede and diere eo: deorlings and feond e: frend</td>
<td>A mixture of eo, and u. eo freond, dore and nede u: freund, fund, þestre, düstrenesse and dure (possibly from WS y (§109.2) but also possibly representing /u:/ from ēo)</td>
<td>Always unrounded eo freond, feond, þestre etc</td>
<td>Mostly e: frend, fentr, dure etc u: þusternesse (possibly from WS y (§109.2) but also possibly representing /u:/ from ēo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ea after æ</td>
<td>Always æ: sal, samie, safte etc</td>
<td>Mostly æ: schal, scals and scamet etc æ: sæft α: some</td>
<td>Mostly æ: sal, samian, shame, etc æ: sel (the more regular writing in this verb) and scete (e is possibly as a result of its position between palatal and dental consonants)</td>
<td>æ: scamet and scamie æ: sæl/ a: scalm, scamian, scamet and scamie íe: scamie</td>
<td>Mostly æ: scalm, scamien, scamet and scamie æ: scalm/samæ æ: scamet</td>
<td>Mostly æ: scalm, scamien, scamet and scamie æ: scamet</td>
<td>Always æ: schal, scal and schaife etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-umlaut of ea after e</td>
<td>e: chele and bicherd</td>
<td>e: chele</td>
<td>e: chele and bicherd</td>
<td>e: chele and bicherd u: chule</td>
<td>e: chele and bi-cherd u: chule</td>
<td>e: chele and bi-cherd u: chule</td>
<td>e: chele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ëa after g</td>
<td>ie: gier</td>
<td>e: ger</td>
<td>ie: gier</td>
<td>e: ger</td>
<td>e: ger</td>
<td>e: yër</td>
<td>e: zer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ie after g</td>
<td>Nearly always ie: forgiet, gielde, gieue etc e: gue</td>
<td>Always ie: forget, geke, gielde etc</td>
<td>Mostly ie: vorgiet, gielde, gieue etc</td>
<td>Mostly writes iːʒ: forgiet, geue, gieued etc u: for-gut ie: gieuen</td>
<td>Mostly writes iːʒ: forgiet, geue, gieued etc u: for-gut and gueue ie: gieued</td>
<td>Always writes e: for-yet, ýeife, ýelde etc</td>
<td>Always writes e: worȝet, ȝeue, bíȝete etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE ie after sc §118</td>
<td>i: silde and silde</td>
<td>e: silde</td>
<td>i: isilde/shilde silden and silten</td>
<td>u: sculde(n) and sculde</td>
<td>e: silde</td>
<td>e: silde</td>
<td>e: silde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE eo after §119 and §120</td>
<td>u: gung and gunge</td>
<td>u: gung and gungre</td>
<td>eu: geunge</td>
<td>y: eyng</td>
<td>u: gung</td>
<td>y: eyng</td>
<td>y: eyng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE eo after sc</td>
<td>u: sulen/sulle(n)</td>
<td>o: solde(n) and sop</td>
<td>u: sulde(n)</td>
<td>o: solde(n) and sop</td>
<td>u: sculde(n)</td>
<td>o: scolde(n) and sop</td>
<td>u: sculde(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE æ + ʒ/ʃ</td>
<td>Nearly always at mai/maig and dai/daiæ</td>
<td>Nearly always ei: mei, seid/sein, bide and dei</td>
<td>Mostly ai: mai and dai</td>
<td>Nearly always ei: mei, dei/deiæ and seid</td>
<td>Mostly ai: mai and dai</td>
<td>Nearly always æy: maï and daï ey once only: sei</td>
<td>Nearly always æy: maï and daï ey, dai/daiæ and sai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRINITY</th>
<th>LAMBETH</th>
<th>DIGBY</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>McCLEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LWS sæđe / Anglian sægdæ § 123</td>
<td>Mostly a: sæđe(n) ai once only: issaid</td>
<td>Mostly e: sæđe(n) e: sæđe</td>
<td>Always e: sæđe(n)</td>
<td>Always e: sæđe and ised</td>
<td>Always e: sæđe and ised</td>
<td>Always ey: sæđe(n)</td>
<td>Nearly always et. sæđe e: sæđe n: once only: sæđe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE æ 가지고 (Angl. Kent, &lt;e&gt; /œ/) + ȝ ][ § 124 and § 125</td>
<td>ai: mai and grai wæi: mei et. ise(n) and niseen</td>
<td>et. mei eg: isegen and nisegen</td>
<td>et: mei and isein eg: isegen and ne-isegen</td>
<td>æ: mei and græi et. meie eg: (i)segen</td>
<td>et/ey: mei/mei, grai and seie eg: segen</td>
<td>ey: mei, grey, seyen and seye</td>
<td>et. mei eg: ysege and isege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE æ+ ȝ ][ § 124 and § 126</td>
<td>ea: eider ai: aider</td>
<td>ea: eider</td>
<td>at. aider/aider et. in eider</td>
<td>a: aëder at. aider</td>
<td>ea/ey/ ayr[er/ ayr[er</td>
<td>ey: ey[er</td>
<td>a: ayr[er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE e+ ȝ ][ § 127</td>
<td>ea: eie, eileuche, pei, peyes, pregen, and treiges eg: peæ</td>
<td>ea: eie, eileuche and pei eg: eie, peæs and pege</td>
<td>et. eie, eileuche, pei and peies eg: peæs and pege</td>
<td>ea: eie, eileuche, pei and peies eg: peæs and pege</td>
<td>ea: eie, eileuche, pei and peies eg: peæs and pege</td>
<td>ey/ey. ey[e, wey[e)and wei</td>
<td>ey/ey. ey[e, pey[e] eg: peæs(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE æ+ ȝ ][ § 128 and § 129</td>
<td>ea: forpreien and leie</td>
<td>ea: forpreien</td>
<td>et. vorpreien and leie</td>
<td>ea: leie eg: for-pregen</td>
<td>et. for-preien and leie</td>
<td>ey: for-prey[e and leye</td>
<td>et. forpreie ey: leye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE æa+ ȝ ][ § 128 and § 130</td>
<td>ea: eien and raketeie eg: egen</td>
<td>eg: egen and raketege eg: egen</td>
<td>eg: egen/iege and raketege</td>
<td>ey: eie and raketeie eg: egen</td>
<td>ey: eye and raketeye eg: egen(e) and raketeze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>LAMBETH</td>
<td>DIGBY</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>JESUS</td>
<td>McCLEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ǝ + h (g)</td>
<td>§ 132</td>
<td>oh: foh and oh</td>
<td>ah: ahte</td>
<td>ah: fab and ah</td>
<td>ah: ah</td>
<td>ou: fou</td>
<td>aȝ: faye and aȝe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ah: acht/en</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>au: aht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ǝ + h</td>
<td>§ 132 and § 133</td>
<td>ai: aihte and taihte</td>
<td>e. echte</td>
<td>e. tehte and ehте</td>
<td>e. ehte</td>
<td>e. ehte</td>
<td>aý: aŷhte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. tachte</td>
<td>a. tachte</td>
<td>a. ahте</td>
<td>e. eichte</td>
<td>a. tachte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>au: aht and tahuhte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ǝ + h</td>
<td>§ 134</td>
<td>o: unboht, biþoht, brohte etc</td>
<td>α unbocht, biþoht, brohte etc</td>
<td>o: unboht, biþoht, brohte etc</td>
<td>ou: vn-bouht, biþouhte, brouhte etc</td>
<td>o: biþoht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE ǝ + /ȝ/</td>
<td>§ 136</td>
<td>ǝg: lage/lagenses</td>
<td>ǝg: lage and dragen</td>
<td>ǝg: dragen, lage(n) and lage-lease</td>
<td>ǝg: dragen/ dragen, laghe, lage and lage-lese</td>
<td>ǝg: lage</td>
<td>aw: drawen, laues and lawe-leve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aw: drawen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ow: mowe and owen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>LAMBETH</td>
<td>DIGBY</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>JESUS</td>
<td>McCLEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OE ā + w</strong></td>
<td>Always ow: cnaped, blope, sople/sowel etc</td>
<td>aw: mapen and blope</td>
<td>ow: (i)knoped, knopen and blope</td>
<td>Mostly ap: icnape, blope, sup[e] etc</td>
<td>op: mopen</td>
<td>ow: iknowe, (i)knowe f and blowep</td>
<td>ow: mopen, iknowe, blopef etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OE ō + w</strong></td>
<td>e: repen and sepen</td>
<td>α: repen and sopen</td>
<td>e. repen iε: repen and siepe</td>
<td>ea: seopen u: rapen</td>
<td>eo: seopen u: rapen</td>
<td>ea. reowe and seowe e. rewe</td>
<td>e. repe and sepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the i-umlaut is e: untrypnesse.</td>
<td>the i-umlaut is o: untrypnesse</td>
<td>the i-umlaut is u: untrypnesse</td>
<td>the i-umlaut is e: untreunesse</td>
<td>the i-umlaut is e: untreunesse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OE ǣ + w</strong></td>
<td>ea on two occasions: feape</td>
<td>ea on two occasions: feape</td>
<td>ea: veape ix: viepe</td>
<td>ea: feape e: fepe iε: fiepe</td>
<td>e: lepe eu: lepe</td>
<td>e: fewe</td>
<td>e. usepe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRUCTURE AND PROSODY

In the section on Textual History, I argued that, in the context of a language and literary culture undergoing radical change and displacement, the *Conduct of Life* bears witness to the persistence of English literary forms and their adaptation to, and coexistence with, new forms of French and Latin literature. In this section, I show how, as a text designed and adapted for memorization, and with specific roles in a memorial culture, this longevity was assured, to an extent, by the *Conduct*’s mastery of verse form and homiletic tropology, and how it emerges as a sermon adapted precisely to its hortatory and contemplative function.

The strength of the *Conduct of Life*’s prosody may also go some way to explaining its longevity and the breadth of its dissemination. Like much of what is contained within the verse-sermon, the rhyme and metre of the *Conduct of Life* are designed to suit the purpose of the work itself. The structure of the verse form complements the content. The regular verse pattern of the *Conduct of Life* makes it ideal for memorising by a preacher, and also a female religious, as does the use of the couplets. Both of these might function within the *Conduct of Life* as mnemonic devices, which could aid a preacher in remembering and, therefore, delivering the sermon to its intended audience (*possibly* without having the codex before him). The strong divisions of half-line, full-line and rhymed couplet would not only aid performance but also ensure that a listening audience could access applicable parts if not the whole. The structure and formation of the verse is perfect for recall, with the strong stress system of the *Conduct of Life* having a similar cadence to song.

The specific verse form of the *Conduct of Life* is also an indicator of a literary culture in flux. That is not to overstate the verse-sermon’s importance but rather to posit the *Conduct of Life*, and all its manuscript variants, as examples of how a text can represent not only linguistic change but also changes in form. The verse of the *Conduct of Life* is representative of a movement from
what had previously been a metrically uniform system for articulating verse to what had become polyphonic within two generations of Norman rule. The extraneous continental influences acting upon both metrics and rhyme and the re-emergence of the vernacular in written form make the *Conduct of Life* an ideal resource for the literary historian interested in the development of verse form.

Needless to say, the *Conduct* also owes a debt to the Old English oral tradition. There was in fact a protracted period of indebtedness to the Anglo-Saxon tradition that merges with the new influences of the post-Conquest period. Prior to the Norman Conquest of 1066 the verse form of the Anglo-Saxons was, with some variance, composed as either a long line divided into two halves or two short lines linked to one another by alliteration and stress. It was normal to have four stressed syllables in the long lines (two in the short lines) with two or three (no more) of these syllables being alliterated, for example:

\[
\text{þrymful þunedest, } \text{ond ic ofþyrsted wæs (line 40)} \]

[you were prominent, mighty, and I was very thirsty]

These lines have a natural pause for emphasis across the caesura.

Similarly, the *Conduct* maintains this strong break across the caesura, dividing the long lines into two half-lines or hemstitches:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{To longe} & \mid \text{Ich hab|be child} \mid \text{iben} \mid \text{a word|e and} \mid \text{a dade}, \\
\text{Peih Ich} & \mid \text{bie a winter |eald,} \mid \text{to jung} \mid \text{Ich am} \mid \text{on rade. (3-4/Ω3-Ω4).} \\
& \text{[Too long have I been a child, in words and in deeds,} \\
& \text{Though I am old in years, I am too young in wisdom.]} 
\end{align*}
\]

It would appear that the author of the *Conduct* viewed each hemstitch as a strong, self-contained syntactical unit containing an independent clause which led in turn to a preservation of the full line as similarly ‘complete’ or end-stopped. This preservation of the integrity of the full line leads to a

---

final pause at the end of each metrical and rhymed couplet. In comparison with this regimented parataxis the Old English poets often structured their verse by enjambling their full lines and making the mid-line break stronger than that found at the end line:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Geofon yþum weol} \\
&\text{in wintrys wylm. Git on wæteres æht} \\
&\text{seofon niht swuncon. He þe æt sunde oferflat,} \\
&\text{hæfde mare mægen.}^{538} \quad (\text{Beowulf} 515-18) \\
&\text{[The sea welled up in waves,} \\
&\text{the surge of winter; the two of you toiled} \\
&\text{for seven nights in the water’s power. He outdid you in swimming,} \\
&\text{had the greater might.]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

While an indebtedness to Old English half-lines might be seen in the metrics of the *Conduct of Life* it should also be acknowledged that the verse form of the early Middle English period was being acted on by other factors than simply an emergence out of Old English.

Old English alliteration has been replaced structurally in the *Conduct of Life* by the use of end-rhyme. The *Conduct of Life* does, however, maintain some alliteration within its lines. Alliteration is used for emphasis, as in lines such as:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{He is b}uuen \text{ us and b}ineðen, b}iforen \text{ and b}ihinde (87/ \Omega 89) \\
&\text{[He is above us and beneath, before and behind]} \\
&\text{or} \\
&\text{Are d}ead\text{ and d}om cumeð to his d}ure, \text{ he maiʒ him sore a}дрade (125/ \Omega 129) \\
&\text{[Ere death and judgement come to his door, he may be sore afraid]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Within lines, such as the ones above, the stress is placed upon the alliterating syllables and is used at times of heightened emphasis. The use of alliteration in the *Conduct of Life*, as in other examples of early Middle English verse, is used with much more freedom than in Old English verse, where it is structurally necessary. A good example of how a scribe felt at ease in adapting the alliterative

---

qualities of the *Conduct of Life*, noted by Hill,\(^\text{539}\) can be seen in two different variant readings of the same line within the verse-sermon. Line 300/Ω31I of Trinity reads, ‘Ne sullen nafre cumen ut for peni ne for punde’ [Nor shall they ever come out, for a penny nor for a pound], where, in all other manuscript witnesses it reads ‘vor marke ne vor punde’\(^\text{540}\). It is impossible to state with any certainty whether ‘peni’ replaced ‘marke’ in this collocation at some point in the text’s transmission or vice-versa, although according to Hill the former is the more likely. What it does indicate is that the scribe felt at ease with either creating or removing alliterative phrases and that their presence within the verse was ornamental rather than structural.

The abandonment of the extended syntactic complexity of Old English verse in favour of the strong syntactical units present in the *Conduct of Life* may seem regressive but it demonstrates a fluidity and freedom not present in the older literature. To speak of the verse form as being both confined by regimented clauses and showing greater fluidity and freedom might appear contradictory at first but early Middle English verse was not regulated by the use of alliteration, end rhyme or a strict adherence to word stress and metre. Friedlander proposes that the verse is ‘both chaotic and monotonous, because it possesses stylistic variety but does not admit of systematic complication or “counterpointing.”\(^\text{541}\)

Friedlander, furthermore, suggests that the use of rhyme in early Middle English was not a response to the influx of French verse post-Conquest, but was as a result of the growing influence of Latin, brought about by the weakening of the vigorous Germanic tradition at a time when changes in language made it syntactically viable or unavoidable.\(^\text{542}\) The *Conduct of Life* adheres to this development whilst also still containing many of the elements of pre-Conquest verse, and has a

---

\(^{539}\) Hill 1977, p. 104.

\(^{540}\) This second reading is taken from D. All of the remaining manuscripts that have this reading (E2, E1 and J) agree with D on this with some orthographical variation.


\(^{542}\) Friedlander, ‘Early Middle English accentual verse’, p.229.
vocabulary that is almost all derived from Anglo-Saxon, accommodated within a new structural form based upon the familiar septenarii of Goliardic song.\textsuperscript{543}

Traditionally the Septenarius is a purely syllabic metre with seven feet. It can be found either with or without end-rhyme. The line is divided in two across a caesura, with the first section of the line having four strong stresses and the second three. The first half-line has a masculine ending and the second a feminine. The trochaic rhythm of the Septenarius is often turned into iambic by an additional syllable acting as prelude to either of the half lines: \((x)\bar{x}xxx\bar{x}x\|\bar{x}xxx\bar{x}\). A regimented adherence to this structure can be found within the \textit{Ormulum}, which does not vary from this regularity of metre and strong stress rhythm, and becomes mechanical in its effect. A rigid adherence to this metre by the poet Orm has led scholars to judge the \textit{Ormulum} as being both tedious and soporific.\textsuperscript{544} In the \textit{Conduct of Life}, however, the lines are far less regimented and are regularly syncopated. Hall cites the influence of native prosody on the author of the \textit{Conduct} as a possible reason for this variation.\textsuperscript{545} As Hall makes apparent, a regular line, such as line 37/Ω38 in Lambeth and quoted below, is uncommon in the \textit{Conduct of Life}:

\begin{verbatim}
þe Món | þe wúle sik|er bón || to há|b|en Gó|d|es blíssè
[The man who desires to make sure of God’s bliss]
\end{verbatim}

Arguably, the author of the \textit{Conduct of Life} was less interested in the exactness of his metre than Orm. There is fluidity within the structure. Hall scans the first 30 lines of Lambeth (examples given below) demonstrating just how variable the metre can be.\textsuperscript{546} As stated previously, the septenary line normally began with an extra anacrustic, unstressed syllable prefixed to it, but in the first 30 lines of the Lambeth version of the \textit{Conduct of Life} this prelude is wanting on 10 occasions (lines: 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 14, 20, 24, 27, 28) as in:

\textsuperscript{544} Bennett and Gray, \textit{Middle English Literature: 1100-1400}, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{546} Hall, \textit{Part Two: Notes} pp. 327–329
When I bethink me well on it, full sore I am in dread.

The prelude is wanting in the second half-line on twelve occasions (lines: 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 30) an example of which can be found at line 12 which reads:

| pa múch|el fúl|ié | his wíl || híne | sólf he bí|swíkeð (12/Ω14). |
| He who follows his will greatly, he deceives himself |

As can be seen, there are 4 occasions listed above where the prelude is missing from both the first and second half-lines, such as:

| élde | me is | bistól|len ón || ér ich | hit | wiste (15/Ω18). |
| Old age is stolen upon me before I knew it |

In one line the prelude is doubled so that the line reads:

| Soht is þét | is óð|ers món|nes frón|d || bétre | þén his | ázen (30/Ω31). |
| He is a fool who is a better friend to others than to himself |

On three occasions (lines 15, 20 and 22) the unstressed foot of part of the line is missing:

| ne lipnie ná | món | to múch|el || to ch|ild|e né | to w|iue (22/Ω25) |
| Let no man trust too much to child nor to wife |

and sometimes it is of two syllables (lines 8, 12, 24, 26 and 29) as in:

| for bét|ere is án | elmés|se bifóre || þé|nne | bōð after | sóuene (26/Ω29) |
| for one alms before is better than are seven after |

where it occurs three times.

Differences are also evident between manuscripts. If we compare the opening of three of the manuscripts we can see this in practice:

| Ich ám | nu éld|er pán| Ich wás || a wínt|re  ānd || a lórè (Trinity) |
|Ich am | élder | bán|e | Ich wás || of wínt|re  ānd || of lórè (McClean) |
|Ich am | élder | bán|e | ic wěs || a wínt|re and || éc a lórè (Digby) |

The above demonstrates how each redactor was responsible for adapting the metrics of the verse line within the framework of the septenary line. It is difficult to state with certainty whether one scribe
adapted his variant from another, or from an intermediate manuscript with a different line of
descent from the original, but it does suggest that the scribes felt at ease with changing the metrics
of the line and did not view the verse form as something fixed.

In general the verse of the Digby manuscript version of the *Conduct of Life* is the most
regular but within its lines metrical variety is present. Feminine endings before the caesura were
not uncommon in the *Conduct*, as in:

ic ealdi more, þanne ic dede
mi wit æste to bi more. (Digby 3-4/Ω2)

See also: *ique* 17, *muze* 41, 45, *stede* 51, *biuore* 55 (these are just a few examples of the many found
within the *Conduct of Life*). In all of these cases, where a short vowel sound is followed by a
consonant and then a further vowel, elision must take place in order to remove the lowering syllable
and maintain the regularity of the beat. In such cases as the lines quoted above (Digby 3-4/Ω2) Fulk
argues that, rather than representing a want of skill in the handling of the septenary, the joining of
the second syllable of *dede* with the following unstressed word to form a weak position of two
unstressed syllables is an example of Old English resolution: ‘the survival of a property from earlier
native verse.’

Hiatus of *-e* at the end of words also regularly takes place mid-line, as in:

he scal comen on *euele* stede
*bute* god him bi milde. (Digby 51-52/Ω27)

Elision also takes place in mid-line positions where a vowel follows a vowel in sequential syllables,
as in *to jwisse* (Digby 76) *dede ofer* (Digby 211) and *to alesen* (Digby 348). Syncopation of *e* also
regularly occurs within single words of the *Conduct of Life* particularly when forming part of the

---

547 Marcus uses the text of D for the basis of his critical edition and provides a close examination of the metrical variety found in the
text: Hans Marcus, *Das Frühmittelenglische “Poema Morale”*, Palaestra, 194 (Leipzig, 1934)
548 Robert. D. Fulk, ‘Early Middle English evidence for Old English meter: resolution in *Poema Morale*, *Journal of German
inflexional endings –*est*, –*ed*, –*es*, –*en*, and especially when preceding the lowering at the conclusion of the first half-verse:

```
Heuene 7 earðe he ouersiē∂|| his ezhen beðful brihte (Digby 140-141/Ω76)
se witnesse his selue wor kes || to aider sel driue (Digby 212-213/Ω121)
```

However, the *e* is usually voiced if it occurs at the end of the second half-line where it is necessary to complete the rhyme and emphasises the end-stop:

```
Mest al, þet me likede þo
nu hit me misleked∂
se þe muchel volʒed∂ his iwil
him selue he biswiked∂ (Digby 25-28/Ω13-Ω14)
```

and

```
þo riche wene∂ siker bien
þuch walles 7 þurh díches
se de∂ his heʒhte on sikere stede
þet sent hi to heueriche (Digby 77-80/Ω42-Ω43)
```

The rhyme in the *Conduct of Life* preponderates on unstressed final –*e* or –*en*, as shown in many of the previous examples – the final stress normally being on the penult.

As stated previously, the half-lines and full-lines are broken into grammatical units. The caesura does not separate adjectives or prepositions from their corresponding noun, and there is a clear grammatical break or sentence separation between full-lines that did not exist in Old English verse. It would also appear that each verse pair is separated from the next by content.

The principle of end-rhyme and a clear formulaic lay-out informs the whole of the *Conduct of Life*. Within this lyrical framework, the *Conduct of Life* maintains the cadence formed by the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables as a structural device but not one that had to be adhered to with strict rigidity.

Like much of what is contained within the verse-sermon, the rhyme and metre of the *Conduct of Life* are designed to realize the aims of the work itself. The strong structure of the verse
form compliments the content. The rhyming couplets and definite end-stops coalesce with the author’s use of sapiential phrases and maxims. There is an uncomplicated style with a clear intellectual and moral message. Each of the formulaic grammatical units discussed previously encompass, within a framework of accessible rhyme and metre, a clear message for salvation. The verse-sermon can be broken down grammatically, structurally and by theme for the purpose of spiritual edification of its audience. Each of these elements contained within the *Conduct of Life* is designed to complement the others and contribute to the overall purpose of the verse-sermon: the saving of the individual’s soul.

Treharne says of the *Conduct of Life* that, ‘the regular beat, like that of the *Orrmulum*, makes this an ideal rhythm for oral delivery.’ This ‘regular beat’ creates an oratorical quality through the alternation of trochaic and iambic half-lines within a structure of septenary rhyming couplets. It is, in part, this quality that suggests that the *Conduct of Life* was intended to form part of pastoral materials intended for a preacher to use whilst ministering to his congregation in the vernacular. The positioning of the *Conduct of Life* within two homiliaries, Lambeth and Trinity also supports this.

The seven strong stresses, with a caesura after the fourth, and the end line rhyming couplets, give this verse sermon its performative cadence; they also, however, serve another essential purpose for both preacher and audience - one of memorization. See below:

```
Wel longe | ich hāblbe child |ibon || a wórd|le ént | a dede
Pāh ich | bo a | wintre |áld || to ŋung | ich ém | on ōre (Lambeth 3-4/Ω3-Ω4)
```

The verse-sermon's survival has, in my opinion, more than a little to do with its regular metre and rhyme, as well as its reliance on stock-images of Heaven and Hell. This metrical frame-work housing themes that would be recognised instantaneously by a contemporary audience meant that

---

the sermon would have been considered an easy choice for public performance and, as the later manuscripts testify, for private meditation. The dissemination of the text might, under these circumstances, be seen as reflecting how easy the Conduct of Life would have been to remember for a preacher, audience and/or devout novice.

The mise-en-page of the Conduct of Life in its variant forms might also be regarded as an aide to memorisation and recall. All of the versions of the Conduct of Life, except the one found in Lambeth, are written in single column, running down the centre of the folio, with clear line division. This division occurs at the end of the full-line, except in the case of Digby which is presented in half-lines. All of the texts have key initial letters or words rubricated. In the versions present in Trinity and McClean each new line begins with an enlarged capital. This capital is touched red in McClean, and at the end of the line a minim height punctus divides the full-lines. In both the versions of the text found in Egerton the initial letter that begins a new couplet is rubricated. Similarly, in the variant from Digby, the letter which begins a new couplet is touched red and placed outside the written grid. As well as being decorative features of the page, these marks would have served as a way of emphasising the verse form and may also have provided memory aids for the reader. They compliment the divisions made by both rhyme and content and would aid in the remembrance of the verse-sermon. These marks and additions to the page should be seen as of a piece with the menometchnical innovations and visual grammar of the page studied by Mary Carruthers.

In addition to this there is also evidence of mnemonic transmission within at least one witnesses of the Conduct of Life that might reflect a wider memorial culture regarding the

---

550 The Lambeth version of the Conduct of Life is written out as prose in the Old English style of verse. I am thankful to Anthony Edwards for his helpful observations here.

551 Mary Carruthers, The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 80-121, 221-257.
dissemination of texts during this period. \footnote{552} In all but one of the versions of the Conduct of Life, the line variations may not be significant enough to contend that transmission and difference was anything other than by redaction, addition and adaptation of an exemplar. \footnote{553} McClean, however, is a witness that omits couplets, \footnote{554} makes additions to the text not found in any other manuscript \footnote{555} and repeatedly presents an order that varies significantly from the other manuscripts. \footnote{556}

What is more, the redactor of the Conduct of Life in McClean introduces, or copies from an exemplar, considerable verbal changes. This has led Paues to contend that the exemplar of the Conduct of Life in McClean or ‘a copy not far removed from it’, \footnote{557} was written from memory; and Hill comes to much the same conclusion, arguing that the text ‘appears to have an oral tradition behind it.’ \footnote{558}

Of these differences many are simple syntactical inversions that might be attributed to adaptation by a scribe or a difference in the exemplar being copied. For example, at line \( \Omega 185 \) McClean writes:

‘Hi sculle to heueneriche fare’ (McClean 166)

Where all of the remaining manuscripts write a variant of:

‘To heueriche hie sulle fare’ (Trinity 178).

\footnote{553} I am not entirely convinced by this, and the matter may warrant further investigation. A description of the line variations can be found preceding the Combined Parallel Texts section of this study and can be traced through that edition of the manuscript witnesses.
\footnote{554} McClean has 365 lines as compared to Trinity, the longest version, which has 400.
\footnote{555} Lines \( \Omega 1-\Omega ii \), \( \Omega 106-\Omega 107 \) and \( \Omega 242-\Omega 243 \) are not found in any other manuscript.
\footnote{556} The text of McClean demonstrates regular instances of two or more couplets reversed, but in the same context as the other MSS, and also couplets presented in a different context to the other manuscripts. See Appendix 1 to Hill 1977, p. 141, and the Introduction to Combined Parallel Texts in this study.
\footnote{558} Hill 1950, p. 352.
There are also one-word differences that might also be linked to a difference in exemplar or the possibility of ‘preference’ exhibited by the redactor. For example, McClean writes ‘Crist’ where all of the remaining manuscripts have ‘God’ (Ω8), and ‘godes riche’ where it is a variant of ‘heueriche’ (Trinity) in all the other manuscripts (Ω66). Differences in word order and variance in line order, including what appear to be one-word substitutions, are not infrequent in the other texts of the Conduct of Life, but the volume of the differences is much greater in McClean.

However, there are also examples of more significant verbal difference in the version of the Conduct of Life found in McClean that suggest that Conduct of Life might have been available to a compiler from memory rather than from a written witness. A few of these are outlined below to illustrate my point. In line Ω183, McClean states, ‘To þe dome hi sculle come’ (McClean 160) where all the other manuscripts have a variant of ‘Alle hie sulle þider cume’ (Trinity 176). It is possible that the scribe of McClean felt that there was a need to clarify the text at this point, but it is clear from line Ω180 that the narrator is referring to the event of Judgement.

Line Ω235 is a further example of variance, with minor differences found between all of the texts; however, the general meaning of the line is retained: that the words of wise men (from the previous line) are written in a book that one may read. Nonetheless, in McClean the use of the past participle in ‘ihurd rede’, a variant not found in any of the other manuscripts, suggests that the audience have heard these words read to them. In Line Ω237 the writing of ‘þis pord may [...] beo’ instead of ‘Ich can ben’ (Trinity) is a similar example of a small difference that might indicate a text written from memory. The whole line reads ‘Þis pord maþ aþer þef hi sculle beo lichames 7 saule leche’, and has a very different meaning to the other manuscripts. In addition, this variance produces a difficult metre unlikely to have been copied from a written version of the text.

---

559 Hill considers the repetition and difference of usage throughout Trinity and both Egerton texts of the words ‘mirth’ and ‘bliss’ and considers whether these differences are to do with repetitive substitution based on rhetorical effect in Trinity or later ‘preferred variation’ by a redactor ‘working over the common exemplar of the Egerton texts. (Hill 1977, p. 104).

560 As compared to ‘Ich can ben aþer gief isal lichame / sople lache’ in Trinity.
Therefore, the variation might be due to adaptation, embellishment or conscious choice, but it might also be due to imperfect recall.

In light of this study and the observations of Hill and Pauces, the awkward phrasing of such lines as ‘Huat sculle pe come to dome þar angles beþ adradde’ (Ω96) and ‘Ne mai no man deme þane man also riȝte’ (Ω114) might similarly be attributed to the process of, and difficulty in, recall. In addition the line variance and significant omissions cited earlier might now be read in the same way.

This section has contended that the rhyme and metre of the verse-sermon, and the mise-en-page of the manuscripts, in combination with the structure and the formulaic grammatical units, made the Conduct of Life not only accessible to a listening audience but also a text that could have been memorised. The following section on the sources and analogues in the Conduct of Life demonstrates that the verse-sermon utilises gnomic sentiment and sapiential phraseology for the sermon’s primary purpose: the salvation of its audience. However, the use of formulaic phrases would not only have made the verse sermon accessible to the audience but would also have served as mnemonic devices within the memorial culture of the post-Conquest period.

The use of ‘stock images’ and gnomic phrases within the text of the Conduct of Life should not only be considered as coming from a store house of material used in the production of the first text of the verse-sermon but should also be seen as being part of a culture of transmission and dissemination that was based on the memorial. In her study of memorial transmission in Be Heofonwarum, Teresi argues that the text’s formulaic patterns ‘act like versatile containers that can be filled with different adjectives and nouns, depending on the homilist’s creativity’.\(^\text{561}\) The variance within the verse sermon of McClean should also be seen as representing this ‘filling’ of the ‘container’ that is the verse-line of the Conduct of Life. However, it is not just in McClean where this variance takes place.

\(^{561}\) Teresi, ‘Mnemonic transmission’, p. 112.
This modularity could function in a more straightforwardly intertextual way where the sermon drew upon scriptural and apocryphal materials, particularly where representations of the other world or scenes of Judgement were concerned. For example, in lines Ω300 and Ω301 Trinity writes, ‘Ne mai non herte hit þenche ne tunge hit ne mai telle | Hƿu muchele pine ne hƿu fele senden in helle’, with little variance in the other manuscripts, except in Jesus, which writes ‘Ne maẏ non heorte hit þenche, ne no tunge telle. | hw muche pỳne. hw uæle uæondes. beþ in þeostre helle’. The presence of the plural noun ‘uæondes’ and the adjective ‘þeostre’ changes the reading in this line, although the overall message of the line remains the same. The difference could be accounted for by way of adaptation of a known formula within the framework of the verse-line. Whether this difference occurs as a result of the redactor of Jesus, or a witness that Jesus is based on or not far removed, having changed the line or whether this was originally part of the verse-sermon it is not possible to say. It is also possible that the text of Jesus might have been taken down from memory; while other variants in the text may be read as supporting this view, the evidence is certainly not as compelling as in McClean. What is clear from this and the previous examples is that there is adaptability within the representation of these basic resources for the production of both sermons and homilies during this period.

In a final example of variance from McClean we find the lines ‘Suines brede beþ pel suete 7 so hi beþ of þe dere | Al to dere he hi beþ þat þef þar uore his suere’ (Ω152-Ω153). In comparison Trinity writes, ‘Spines brade is pel spete spo is of pilde diere. | Ac al to diere he hit abuið þe ȝiefþ þar for his spiere’ with little variation in the other manuscripts. The difference in the second half-line of Ω153 in McClean, once again, suggests that it was possibly taken down from memory. The themes are retained within the grammatical units of the line and half-line with the overall meaning still

562 Teresi’s study discusses how the text of Be Heofonwarum might have been made up from a ‘common mnemonic repertoire’ of the late Old English period and cites the apocryphal book of the Visio Sancti Pauli as one such source that might have contributed to this. Significantly, the Visio Sancti Pauli is a text that the following section, on the themes present within the text of the Conduct of Life, demonstrates had an influence upon the verse-sermon. (Teresi, ‘Mnemonic transmission’, p.114)
563 This line is not present in either McClean or Lambeth.
retained (remembered) but the difference has an effect on the metre that is unlikely to have been present in the original written text. This line is seen by Hill as having ‘special significance for a twelfth-century audience’, and represents a maxim that reflects contemporary concerns.

Whether through its gnomic appeal, its social valence, or its suitedness to the mobile forms of contemporary memorial culture – or perhaps a combination of these reasons – the same couplet appears in two other contemporary manuscripts. On folio 93r of Maidstone Museum MS A 13 the version of *The Proverbs of Alfred* includes two lines from the *Conduct of Life*, close to the version found in the Lambeth manuscript, in a different hand, situated between the two inner of the three columns of the text: ‘Spines brede is Spiþe Spete |so is pilde dure | al to dure he it a bihþ | Pe ȝih þer fore is Spere’. Two further examples can be found incorporated into Latin sermons and written in the same hand. The first is found within column 2 of the inner margin of folio 46v and reads ‘Swithe Swete is swines brede | so is of pilde dere | Al to dure þe Brede | he buth þe þift midt his owere’. The final occurrence forms part of the Latin text on folio 253r, in column 1 and is part of the incipit: ‘Swþe | swete is swines brede &c’.

These instances of lines found from the *Conduct of Life* further evidence the wealth of material that was available to scribes and compilers from memory in the post-Conquest period. In a discussion of the marginal re-use of Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies* within twelfth-century texts, Swan argues that ‘snippets’ from the homilies ‘look more like the sort of snatches of memorable narrative and gnomic statement easily stored in the memory and recalled.’ This description might also be easily applied to the lines found within Maidstone MS A 13. The variance within the versions of the line written in the same hand and within the same manuscripts also corroborates the contention that

---

564 Hill states that ‘[t]he strict laws of the King's Forest, within whose boundaries whole villages were included, protected wild boar as well as venison, and the forests, the forest laws and the behaviour of the forest officials were a constant source of trouble. The relief given in the Forest Charter, which was issued in 1217, after the succession of Henry III, that “in future no one shall lose life or limb for our venison”, (n.96, pp. 102, 104, 110,113), indicates that this proverbial couplet had a bitter origin.’ (Hill 1977, p. 122).

565 Maidstone Museum MS A 13, is a manuscript written in the hands of several s.xiii scribes. It has 252 leaves with mostly Latin contents. The manuscript, however shares *The Proverbs of Alfred and Long Life* with Oxford, Jesus College 29. See Betty Hill ‘A Couplet from the *Conduct of Life* in Maidstone MS A 13’, *Notes and Queries* 50 (2003), p. 377.

566 Swan, ‘Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*, p. 81.
the lines were often seen as, to use Teresi’s terminology once again, ‘versatile containers’; the sentiment of the line is remembered, *memoria ad res*, if the whole line is not memorised/recalled exactly.\(^{567}\) This can be evidenced further by the presence of a version of the same line in another marginal gloss to a Latin sermon collection in Durham University Library, Cosin V.III.2 s.xiii\(^{\text{in}}\), where at folio 127\(^{v^a}\) the line is written ‘suete bet swines brede ant of wilde dere. harde ye hus abiet hat haruore gift his swire.’\(^{568}\) While there is no evidence that these lines were memorised or copied (with adaptation) from the *Conduct of Life*, it is likely that the composer of the verse-sermon new of these lines and inserted them into his text. It demonstrates that lines of couplets, found in the *Conduct of Life*, were circulating independently of the verse-sermon at this time and that, from the evidence, they should be considered as being part of a text hoard that could be called upon.

A final example of a couplet from the *Conduct of Life* circulating independently is found in London, British Library, Royal 7 C. s.xi\(^1\) where continuous interlinear gloss in English (s.xi\(^{\text{med}}\)) are found to the Defensor’s *Liber scintillarum*. At the end of the *Liber Scintillarum* there are a number of scribbles on what was originally a blank page (folio 106\(^{v}\)). One of these scribbles, partly erased, corresponds to line Ω18-Ω19 and reads, ‘elde me is bistolen on er [.....] Ne mæcio before me [.....]’. A comparison with the corresponding lines found in the other manuscripts of the *Conduct of Life* gives no evidence that this was anything other than a close copy of a witness to the verse-sermon. It does, however, give an indication of the dissemination of the *Conduct of Life* and evidences the idea that end-rhymed couplets of the text were sometimes seen as independent units that could easily be removed from their context within the verse-sermon and used elsewhere.

As has been made explicit previously in this study, both the rhyme and metre of the *Conduct* would have made it ideal for oral delivery and would have aided remembrance for both preacher and audience. The strong divisions of half-line, full-line and rhymed couplet would not

---

567 For the distinction between *memoria ad res* and *memoria ad verba*, see Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 86.
only aid performance but also ensure that a listening audience could access applicable parts if not the whole.
Sources and Analogues

Introduction

Written in the first person, the Conduct of Life represents the experiences and anxieties of an old man as he looks back upon his life and prepares for death. It contains themes reflective of earlier English literary and hortatory texts, such as the ubi sunt? motif, confessional topoi, didactic admonition, and metaphorical self-mortification. In addition, it draws on images of the Harrowing of Hell, of the Last Judgement and of Heaven and Hell that are not only representative of earlier visionary literature and literary tours of the otherworld but also draw upon a living tradition of homiletic prose and verse in the later Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman periods in England.

The Lament of the Old Man

The accounts of Heaven and Hell in the Conduct of Life [232-302/Ω239-Ω313 and 355-96/Ω367-Ω409 respectively] draw, as Betty Hill notes, on a ‘large body’ of Latin and English vision literature.569 That such vision literature continued to be well employed, and even flourished, in the later Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman periods is well attested, although the legitimacy of such accounts of the other world has always been contentious amongst Church writers. Arguably, the most prominent account from this period is the Visio Sancti Pauli, possibly the most influential of the early Christian apocalypses other than the canonical book of Revelation.570 Although the Conduct of Life does not draw directly upon the Visio, the Visio nonetheless functions as a convenient key by which to understand the generic and thematic constituents of the Conduct of Life, as a central source text of the tradition upon which the Conduct draws, and as an index to the ‘

stock themes’ or motifs that Hill identifies as distinguishing the genre. Although it circulated widely in early long Latin and Greek forms and, according to Origen, found acceptance by the Church, the Visio was discredited by Augustine; his objection to it was in part due to the Visio’s attempt to draw authority from 2 Corinthians, which states that such revelations are forbidden. Yet the Visio’s influence can still be found in the work of both the Blickling Homilist and Wulfstan, both of whom appear to know one of the long versions of the text and used it as if it were scripture.

Ælfric also shows an awareness of the Visio but raises the same objections as Augustine. However, while Ælfric challenged the Visio, and its foundation upon 2 Corinthians 12: 2–4, he did accept other visions, and in his Catholic Homilies he offers the vision of Fursey as an alternative and as the first of many exempla on the afterlife. While some visions of the afterlife were discredited, the corpus as a whole contributed to a growing discussion as to what happened to body and soul at the time of death and in the post-mortem world. Foxhall-Forbes states:

The incorporation of these kinds of visions into Aelfric’s own careful explanation of the struggle at death indicates the extent to which he took for granted that this belief was part of orthodox Christian theology, and although these visions stood apart from sacred Scripture, clearly not all visions were suspect if they had significant authority.

During the later Anglo-Saxon period and in the post-Conquest period, shorter Latin redactions of the Visio were also produced, which reshaped the older materials and added numerous interpolations. Significantly, nearly half of the extant manuscripts of these redactions are English, suggesting a particular popularity for the Visio in England. Of these, it is Redaction iv that was

---

571 Hill, “The twelfth-century “Conduct of Life””, p. 119
574 Silverstein, Visio Sancti Pauli, pp. 7-9.
575 Helen Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth in Anglo-Saxon England: Theology and Society in an Age of Faith (Farnham, Ashgate, 2013), pp. 118-119.
576 Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth in Anglo-Saxon England, p. 120.
577 Silverstein, Visio Sancti Pauli, p. 10.
the most popular and influential and which, it has been claimed, was formed in the British Isles under Celtic influence. Significantly, a homily that draws on this redaction circulated with the *Conduct of Life*, as it is present in the Lambeth Homilies under the title 'In Diebus Dominicus'.

Although, as we will see, the similarities between the descriptions of the afterlife in the *Conduct of Life* and earlier and contemporaneous visionary literature yield rich comparisons through close analysis, the narrative technique of the *Conduct of Life* does not conform to the regular formula for visionary portrayals of the other world. Although it does have a first-person narrator who acts as a guide for the audience and urges them to repentance, he is at pains to state that he has never visited Hell: ‘Nafre an helle Ich ne cam, ne cumen Ich þar ne reche’ [Never in hell came I, nor care I to come to that place] (225/Ω232). The narrator is not a visionary, and nor is he re-telling the narrative of a visionary, as is necessarily part of the genre; he does show, however, on a number of occasions, knowledge of the traditions of visionaries, and even accepts their legitimacy and authority. A familiarity with visionary texts or with visionary culture, on the part of both the narrator and (possibly more importantly) his audiences, is clear from line 141/Ω148, where he gives authority to what he is saying through those who have preceded him: ‘Þat habbed isaid þe come þanne þe it wiste mid iwisse’ [Those that have come from that place have said this; they knew it most certainly], with a literary tradition clearly highlighted later in the text when the narrator states ‘Þeih Ich wille seggen eow þat wise men us saden | And a boc hit is write þar me hit mai rade’ [Though I will say to you what wise men told us | And in a book it is written, where one may read it] (227–228/Ω234–Ω235).

Although the narrator in the *Conduct of Life* is not himself a visionary, his inclusion in the sermon does function as a pedagogic and hortatory device, similar to that of the visionary in the corpus of literature that he deliberately calls upon to give his warnings authority, and to teach the

---


penitential way by example and by foregrounding his own declining powers. At the beginning of
the sermon the old man tells the audience that ‘wel longe’ [too long] has he been childlike in ‘worde
and a dade’ [words and in deeds] (3/Ω3). Ideas of being a ‘child’ (3/Ω3), committing ‘fele ʒeunge
dede’ [many childish deeds] (10/Ω10) or of sinful acts that befall to ‘chilce’ [childishness] (7/Ω7) are
repetitive themes within the opening of the sermon. Throughout the text this mental state is
juxtaposed against the decline of the body. The struggle between the spiritual and the physical is a
continuous one for the narrator of the sermon. It is balanced neatly across the caesura of line 4/Ω4
which states: ‘Peih Ich bie a winter eald, to jung Ich am on rade.’ [Though I am old in years, I am
too young in wisdom.] For him age is a very real physical manifestation and one, it would seem,
that it is relative to his spiritual status. In the lines 15-18/Ω16-Ω19 the narrator states:

Ich mihte habben bet idon, hadde Ich ðo iselðe;
Nu Ich wolde, ac Ich ne mai, for elde and for unhalðe.
Elde me is bistolen on ar Ich hit iwiste
Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste. (15-18/Ω16-Ω19)
[I might have done better, had I the discretion;
Now I would, but I am unable through old age and ill-health.
Old age is stolen upon me before I knew it,
I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist.]

The above lines are suggestive, as is much of the remainder of the verse sermon, of another group of
Christian writings extant in this period, whose themes ultimately deal with mutability and death
and which at their extreme manifest themselves in the topoi of memento mori and contemptus
mundi.\textsuperscript{580}

The concerns about death, transience and contempt for this world, found in the Conduct of
Life, are prominent in the twelfth-century determination for penitential self-awareness that asserted
itself not only in Church writings but in a set of didactic texts that focused on the misery of this life.

Two of the most influential Latin tracts that make use of contemptus mundi during this period are

\textsuperscript{580}The influence of the memento mori and contemptus mundi topoi on the Middle English homiletic tradition is discussed in detail in the chapter on ‘The Middle English Homiletic Poems on Death’ in Takami Matsuda, Death and Purgatory in Middle English Didactic Poetry (Cambridge, 1997), 112-146
the pseudo-Bernardian *Meditationes piissimae de cognitione humanae conditionis* and Pope Innocent III’s *De miseria condicionis humane* (1195). Such meditations ‘were repeatedly quarried for sermons, reworked into Latin poems and translated into vernacular exhortations of the bleakest and minatory kind.581 Their influence on contemporary and later Middle English Lyrics is well attested,582 and gives further historical context to the writing of the *Conduct of Life*, which, although it does not rely directly on either text, also places transience, a fear of death, contempt for this world and the need for a quick repentance at its didactic core. The narrator states that:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Death came into this earth through the old devil’s hand,} \\
\text{And sin and sorrow, and toil on water and on land.} \\
\text{We all suffer for our first father’s guilt,} \\
\text{All his offspring after him have fallen into harm,} \\
\text{Through him death came into this earth and other miseries} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The ‘unisalde’ [miseries] (200/Ω207) described in this short section from the *Conduct of Life*, and the assignment of this suffering to ‘Alle þo þe sprung beð of Adam and of Eve’ [All those who have sprung of Adam and of Eve] (175/Ω182) for ‘Vre foremes faderes gult’ [For our first father’s guilt] (197/Ω204), is a well-known didactic formula intended to demonstrate the impotence of the individual within this earthly life. It is found throughout medieval penitential and homiletic literature, with multiple examples also found in both the Trinity and Lambeth Homilies. For example, in *De Sancto Andrea* from Trinity it is stated that ‘on þisse liue we beð on balfulle swinche for adames gulte.’ [In this life we are in sorrowful toil for Adam’s guilt],583 and in Lambeth’s ‘Hic

Dicendum est de Quadragesima’ it is said of the sinner who waits until he is old or sick before he repents that, ‘Þus þe deofel wule bilesnien þe wreche. and ec we ileued to soþe alswa redliche swa adam ure eldre feder us forgulte erest in to helle.’ [Thus the devil will destroy the wretch, and that, we will believe assuredly, as quickly as Adam our forefather first doomed us by his trespass to hell].

In addition, it is also a device that is developed and exploited in later medieval lyrics, most notably, *Lullay, lullay, litel child, why wepestou so sore?*, in which the defencelessness of a child against the suffering of the world and the consequences of original sin are communicated within the words of a mother:

Deth shal comen with a blast
out of a well dim horn,
Adames kin adoun to cast –
himself hath don beforne.
Lullay, lullay, litel child,
so we theee worth Adam,
In the lond of paradis,
through wikkednes of Satan. (53-60)

Gillespie says of these lines that, ‘the pity, sorrow and fear generated by such a poem provided the affective focal point for the didactic message that it is never too soon to start preparing for and thinking about the Last Things.’ In the *Conduct of Life* an emphasis is similarly placed, throughout the sermon, on the immediacy of the need to repent, most urgently in the lines:

Þanne þe deað is at þe dure, wel late he biddeð ore;
Wel late he lateð euel were þan he hit ne mai don no more. (127-28/Ω132-Ω133)
[When death is at the door, too late he prays for forgiveness; Too late he hates evil work when he may not to do it anymore.]

The *Conduct of Life*, consequently, shares many of the characteristics and themes that are found in contemporary and later Middle English lyrics on death, summarized by Matsuda in the following quotation:

---

584 Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 23.
585 Gillespie, ‘Moral and Penitential Lyrics’, 72
They are hortatory poems with a homiletic function of making an audience realise the uncomfortable reality of ill-prepared death and the dreadful consequences of leading a sinful life. They draw the attention of the audience to various aspects of the precarious condition of man in this world, including the vileness of the body, the misery of the grave, the deceptiveness of the world, the mutability of life, the miserable birth of man, the certainty of death, and the dread of hell and the Last Judgement, reiterating all too common calls to swift repentance. For that reason, there is little room for philosophical reflection on the meaning of death.\textsuperscript{586}

Matsuda goes on to say of the Middle English lyrics on death that ‘the insignificance and vanity of worldly achievement can be evoked in the form of rhetorical questioning by the \textit{ubi sunt} and \textit{quid profuit} formulae.’\textsuperscript{587} The narrator of the \textit{Conduct of Life} equally emphasises the transience of earthly belongings through such questioning: ‘Hwat sulle we beren us biforen, mid hwan sulle we iqueme, | We þe nafre god ne duden, þan hevenliche Deme?’ [What shall we bear before us, with what shall we please (God), | We that never did good, to (please) the heavenly Judge?] (95-96/Ω98-Ω99). The author’s intention is to highlight the need for individual repentance and his emphasis has always been on the ineffectual benefits of the wealth of this world. The above quotation is part of a movement in this sequence that is successful in portraying man’s weakness when faced with the scene of Judgement.\textsuperscript{588} The author achieves this through a series of rhetorical questions in which his use of the first person plural situates him within the general throng:

\begin{quote}
Wi hwat sal us to rade  
We þe brekeð Godes has and gulteð swo ilome?
Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don at þe muchele dome,  
We þe luueden unriht and euel lif ladden?
Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don þar ængles beð ofdradde? (90-94/Ω92-Ω96)  
[Alas, what shall save us  
We who break God’s behests and sin so often?  
What shall we say or do at the great doom,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{586} Matsuda, \textit{Death and Purgatory}, p. 113.  
\textsuperscript{587} Matsuda, \textit{Death and Purgatory}, pp. 113-14.  
\textsuperscript{588} A similar contention is also made by Hill, ‘The twelfth-century “Conduct of Life”’, p. 118.
We who loved unright, and evil life led?
What shall we say or do, when the angels shall be in dread?'

He then moves the audience to a state of repentance in the subsequent lines by removing any other rational choice, invoking the ever-present shadow of death in order to emphasize once again the need for immediate repentance: ‘Ac al his lif sal ben teald after his endinge. | ʒief þe endinge is god al hit is god and euel ʒief euel is þe ende.’ [But all his life shall be judged after his ending (death); | If his end is good it is all good, and evil if evil is the end.] (120-121/Ω125-Ω126).

From the very first couplet of the *Conduct of Life*,589 the certainty of death, the false vanity of this world and the need for repentance in view of the infernal consequences described later in the sermon, are ever-present. The first 150 lines of the *Conduct of Life*, therefore, have much in common with the loose narrative framework set up in medieval lyrics on death, such as the lament of the old man or a warning from the dead or from the figure of death himself, and although at first penitential in tone, becomes – much like the lyrics – a more general voice of warning.590

The author of the *Conduct of Life* creates a narratorial persona that is easily accessible to a listening audience (1-4/Ω1-Ω4): a visual reminder of what is at stake, an aged everyman figure lamenting his misspent youth and regretting his delay in repentance. As in the visionary material, widespread during the period, to which the descriptions of the otherworld in the *Conduct of Life* are clearly indebted – as will be shown later in this introduction – the narrator, like the visionary, acts as a guide to the audience, bringing them to a point of recognition and urging them to repent before it is too late (100/Ω103).

The narrator, like the figure of the old man in the medieval Laments, makes interjections throughout the sermon, personalising the narrative and creating a dialogue – frequently admonitory – with his audience. This dialogue endows the sermon with a performative quality, present not only

---

589 “Ich am nu elder þan Ich was a wintre and a lore, | Ich wealde more þan Ich dude, mi wit oh to be more” [I am now older in years and in learning, | I wield more than I did, my wit ought to be more.]
in the cadence and rhythm of its septenary rhyming couplets but also in the role of the preacher as
guide, advocate and example.

**Soul and Body**

As the previous example demonstrates, the *Conduct of Life* is primarily concerned with the state of
the soul before death as a determining factor in the destination of the soul post-mortem, and yet the
focus of the audience, as they look upon the preacher or contemplate the words of the sermon, must
necessarily be on the corporeal. Before them they have an individual – a physical presence if we
accept the premise of the *Conduct of Life* as a text for preaching, and if not a purely figurative one
– whose lament for his own spiritual neglect reflects his physical degeneration. For, he says, ‘Deih
Ich bie a winter eald, to jung Ich am on rade’ [Though I am old in years, I am too young in
wisdom.] (4/Ω4); he acknowledges that he could have done more, and yet ‘Nu Ich wolde, ac Ich ne
mai for elde and for unhalðe’ [Now I would, but I am unable through old age and ill-health.] (16/Ω
17). The narrator reminds us through his own person that all mankind is born astride the grave and
that life is fleeting; however, this is coupled with an exhortation to immediate repentance and a
good end to life as ‘al his lif sal ben teald after his endinge. | ʒief þe endinge is god al hit is god and
euel ʒief euel is þe ende’ [all his life shall be judged after his ending (death); | If his end is good it is all
good, and evil if evil is the end.] (120-21/Ω125-Ω126)

This emphasis on the body is a constant in the *Conduct of Life*, not only in the sections
concerning the narrator but also in the sections concerning Hell and Heaven – as will be seen. In
comparison, the *Conduct of Life* only makes two direct references to the soul. The first is in line
306/Ω317, where he states ‘Ich can ben aiðer, ʒief Ich sal, lichame and sowle lache’ [I can be both, if I
am allowed, the body’s and soul’s leech]; and the last is in the final exhortation of the sermon in
which he claims that God will bring those who are deserving to heavenly bliss: ‘Þane he ure sowle
unbint of lichamliche bende’ [When he our souls unbinds from the body’s bonds] (398/Ω415).

Significantly, both of these lines can also be read as making direct references to the body.

First, then, the preacher claims that he can, if permitted, be a leech for both the body and the soul. Hill argues that this line is ‘a reference to the priest’s power to save by instruction’.591 This is one of only a few points at which the narrator interrupts the sermon and returns to the first person. It is seen by Hall as an indication that the writer might have been ‘a priest with some knowledge of medicine’.592 While this may be the case, the evidence is very limited and is based only on this line and on the earlier line concerning blindness. It is more likely that the author is using the metaphor of the ‘lache’ to reiterate his role as a preacher, to break the flow and bring the audience back to the immediacy of their surroundings as well as emphasizing his own redemptive function.

The use of the leech, or physician, for body or soul, or both, is a common formula in homiletic texts from this period. It is often applied to Christ himself. In ‘In Die Natalis Domini’ from Trinity, for example Christ is described as ‘alre lechene leche. þe com to helen þe wundes. þe þe deuel hadde on mancun broht’ [the physician of all physicians, who came to heal the wounds that the devil had brought upon mankind].593

However, in In Quadragesima [Dominica II] from Trinity it is ‘Þe heuenliche leche seinte poul’ [The heavenly physician St. Paul] who ‘nimeð geme of ure saule sicnesse.’ [taketh heed of our soul’s sickness],594 and in On Lofsong of ure Lefdi it is ‘Swete leafdi seinte marie’ [Sweet Lady Saint Mary] who ‘beo mi leche’ [be my leech].595 There are further examples in both Trinity and Lambeth

593 Morris, Old English Homilies, p. 41. See also The passion of our Lord in Jesus (Morris 1872, p. 39): ‘Swich leche bi-vore hym. ne com her neuer non’ [There was never such a leech as he (Christ)], and On Ureisun of oure Lourede in Lambeth (Morris 1867, p. 187): ‘min heoueneleche leche. þet makedest us of þi seolf se miti medicine. ibesed beo þu euer as mi trusts is þer to. hit beo mi lechunge hit beo mi bote. [My heavenly leech (physician), that for us makest of thyself so mighty a medicine, blessed be thou for ever! As my trust is thereto, let it be my healing, let it be my remedy.]’
594 Morris, Old English Homilies, p. 77.
595 Morris 1867, p. 205.
where it is the priest who acts as leech or physician, usually in exhortations to confession. In *De confessione* from Trinity it is stated that:

> Ure sauile is sore forwunded. for ech sỳnne is þe sauile wunde. *and* prest is saulene leche. [...] for no man ne mai sỳnnes beten er þanne he hem forlete. *and* shewe em his prest. *and* nime shrifte þerofe. [Our soul is sorely wounded; for every sin the soul’s wound; and the priest is a physician of souls; [...] for no man may repent of his sins before he has foresaken them and has shown them to his priest and has been shriven thereof].

The previous examples, taken from contemporaneous homilies, focus on the state of the soul by using language normally associated with the body, and the role of confession by the priest in achieving salvation. However, in the *Conduct of Life*, the redemption of both the body and the soul do appear to be related and almost inseparable, in what might be seen as the preacher’s ability to reverse the parallelism of bodily and spiritual degeneration described earlier.

In line 398/Ω415, however, the realization of heaven post-mortem can only be accomplished, as far as the *Conduct of Life* is concerned, by the unbinding of the soul from the bonds of the body. According to the narrator, this can only be achieved by God himself. The soul/body dualism neatly (or not so neatly) presented in both of these lines - one of them advocating a mutual relationship in this world and the other a need, ultimately, for separation in the next - is a

---

221

---

906 Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 57. See also *Hic Dicendum est de Quadragesima* (Morris 1867, p. 23) in Lambeth:

> Ne þe preost þe ne mei scrife bute þu wulle heo aflorleten. Hu mei þe leche þe lechnien þa hwile þet ired sticat in þine wunde. Nefre. [The priest may not shrive thee, unless thou wilt entirely forsake thy sins. How may the physician heal thee whilst the iron sticketh in thy wound?]

and *De Natale Domini* (Morris 1867, 83) in Lambeth:

> Nu bihoueð þe forwunded wreche þet he habbe leche. we boð forwunded us bi-houed leche. Adam wes ilechned þurh god almihti solf, *and* us bi-houed leche þurh pretes mud. he weis his wunde mid wine. hwet is win in wunde ðe Win makoð wunde smerte. Ah þe smertinge clenoeð þe wuode. ðwa þet ho ne scal of þere wunde habbe nan oðer weul. Al so halı scrift bið in mine ure wuode hwaw we scale festen. *and* feelis bileuene and sachel of ure [mine] wille for ure [mine] wrecchede. Hwet is þet olı; *and* Olı haued huppen him lihtnesse and softnesse and hele. Also þu scalt habben hweonne þu hauest idon þi scrift of þine misede þenne þu scalt habbe lihtnesse and softnesse and hele. [Now it behoveth the wounded wretch to have a physician (leech). We are wounded and stand in need of a leech. Adam was healed through God Almighty himself, and it behoveth us to be healed through the priest’s mouth. He washed his wounds with wine. What is wine in a wound? Wine maketh the wound smart, but the smarting cleanseth the wound, so that it receives no further injury. Just so holy shrift shall be in our wounds when we fast and renounce the flesh and much of our will (lusts) on account of our sins. What is oil? Oil hath in itself the properties of lightness and softness and healing. Such shalt thou have when thou hast performed thy shrift of thy misdeeds, then shalt thou have lightness and softness and healing.]
complex area of theology which, as will be demonstrated, was heavily discussed and contested during the post-Conquest period. There are many examples within post-Conquest literature where the soul decries the body for its actions in life, suggesting that the body is acting against the helpless soul’s desires. For example, in *Sinners Beware*, also present in *Jesus*, the narrator tells his audiences how the damned soul curses the body for all of its suffering:

\[\text{Þe saule seyþ to þe lychome.} \]
\[\text{Acursed wurþe þi nome.} \]
\[\text{Þin heaued and þin heorte.} \]
\[\text{Þu vs hauest iwroht þes schome.} \]
\[\text{And alle þene eche grome.} \]
\[\text{Vs schal euersmerte. (331-336)} \]

[The soul says to the body, 'Accursed be thy name, your head and your heart. You have caused us this shame and all this eternal sorrow. We shall forever suffer'.]

A similar curse by the soul of the damned on the body that bore it in this life is found in *Death*, also from *Jesus*:

\[\text{Þenne seyþ þe saule.} \]
\[\text{wiþ sorie chere.} \]
\[\text{Away þu wrecche fole baly.} \]
\[\text{nv þu lyst on bere.} \]
\[\text{Ich schal habbe for þe.} \]
\[\text{feondes to i-ver.} \]
\[\text{Away þat þu eure.} \]
\[\text{to monne ischape were. (81-88)} \]

[Then says the soul with a sorrowful expression, 'Away you miserable, foolish evil doer. Now you lie in your grave, I shall have because of you devils as companions. Away, that you ever wore the shape of a man'.]

---

597 Morris 1872, p. 83.
598 An item Jesus shares with Cotton MS. Caligula A ix
599 Morris 1872, p. 173.
In both Trinity and Lambeth we can find further laments, and also praise, made by the soul towards the body. Perhaps the most notable example can be found in Sancto Andrea, from Trinity, which contains the riposte of the soul to both the ‘righteous body’ to whom ‘wo beð þe sowle þanne hie him shal forleten’ [sorrowful shall the soul be when she must leave it], and the ‘evil body’ who ‘loð is heo þe sowle. and hire þunche þe lang þat hie on hi bileued’ [loathsome is it to the soul, and it appears long for her to remain in it].

The section on the ‘evil body’ continues with a shocking lament against the body by the soul, which says:

Aweilewei þu fule hold þat ich auere was to be iteied. long habbe ich on þe wuned. swo wo is me þe hwile. for al þat me was leof þ hit was þe loð. þu ware a sele gief ich was wroð. To gode þu ware slau and let. and to euele spac and hwat. Al þat good het. þe þuhte andsete. þat forbode þe þuhte swete. Iuele wurmes mote þe chewe swo we þe be þat tu me [ne] rewe. for þine gulte ishal nu to pine. rotie mote þu to time.

[Alas! thou foul abode, that I was ever tied to thee. Long have I dwelt in thee, and woe betide me the while! For all that was dear to me was distasteful to thee. Thou wast joyful if I was angry; thou wast slow and slack to [do what was] good, but quick and eager to [do] evil. All that God enjoined appeared hateful to thee, and what he prohibited appeared sweet to thee. May evil worms gnaw thee; so woe be to thee that thou didst not pity me; for thy faults I must now go into torment; mayest thou rot for ever!]

In this passage it is unequivocally the body that has brought the soul to this point with such devastating consequences; however, in praising the ‘righteous body’ the soul says ‘þu ware me lastful on alle þo þe ich wolde. we ware onmode godes wille to done’ [thou wert obedient to me in all that I wished. We were of one mind to do God’s will]. These lines suggest, first, a constant conflict between the soul and body that cannot be simplified by presuming that the body is acting autonomously; and second, through the adjective ‘lastful’, that the soul has the ability to influence the actions of the body.

With this in mind, it is important to turn to scriptural authority in discussing this relationship. In Galatians 5:16-17, Paul states that:

---

600 Morris, Old English Homilies, p. 183.
I say then, walk in the spirit and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the spirit: and the spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary one to another: so that you do not the things you would.

Paul continues by listing ‘the works of the flesh’, which include fornication, uncleanness, wrath, quarrels, murders and drunkenness. He then tells of the ‘fruit of the spirit’ which includes charity, peace, goodness, mildness and chastity. Once again, on first reading it may seem that responsibility for all flagitious acts lies with the body but, on closer inspection, Verse 17 suggests that the spirit has at least the ability and moreover the responsibility to fight against the sins of the flesh.

The idea of culpability, or mutual responsibility, is further set out by Augustine, who was considered an influential guide to doctrinal practice during this period; he states in City of God, Book XIV, Chapter 3, that:

> Quod si quisquam dicit carnem causam esse in malis moribus quorumcumque vitiorum eo quod anima carne affecta sic vivit, profecto non universam hominis naturam diligenter advertit. [Now someone may contend that the flesh is the cause of every sort of vice in the case of bad morals on the ground that it is the influence of the flesh on the soul that makes the soul lead that kind of life. But if he does, surely he has not seriously considered the whole of man's natural being].

For, according to Augustine, the reality is quite different:

> Nam corruptio coporis, quae adgravat animan, non peccati primi est causa, sed poena, nec caro corruptibilis animam peccatricem, sed anima peccatrix fecit esse corruptibilem carmen. [For the body's decay, which weighs down the soul, is not the cause of the first sin but the punishment for it, nor is it the flesh, which is subject to decay, that makes the soul sinful; it is the sinful soul that makes the flesh subject to decay].

---

602 Augustine, City of God, pp. 270-271.
Suzannah Biernoff states that ‘it is evident from Augustine’s terminology that flesh refers to a condition of the mind or soul, as well as to a type of corporeal motivation or appetite.’

For Augustine, body and soul were not merely binary, but part of a divided self that coexisted as the ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ man; and this formula ‘was widely used throughout the Middle Ages to evoke a sense of the self, fractured and polarised by sin.’ For example, to return to On Lofsong of Ure Lefdi, in Cotton Ms. Nero A xiv, the sinner lists his sins – which might be considered to be of both a physical and a spiritual nature – before concluding that he has:

```
mid fleshes fulde ifuled me. þus ich am lodliche i-hurt ine licame. and ine soule ði wið alle cunnes sunnen. for þauh þet werc nere I þe bodie ðe wil was in þe heorte.
[with the filth of the flesh defiled myself. Thus I am loathsomely hurt in body and in soul with sins of all kinds; for though the work was not in the body the will was in the heart.]
```

For Augustine, and the later medieval thinkers influenced by his teachings, ‘flesh’ was more than just the body’s physical existence; the idea of ‘flesh’ as something other than the simply material existence of matter complicates any dualistic idea of Body and Soul. For example, for the Cistercian St Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux from 1115 to 1153, the body is not necessarily deleterious, although he sometimes refers to it as a prison or tomb; it is sin that is evil and the responsibility for this lies in the will (part of the soul). However, as Caroline Walker Bynum argues, Bernard does see ‘the change to which the body is subject [as] ... primarily negative: of itself body is more often subject to decay than to positive transformation,’ an idea borne out in the Conduct of Life, where the decline of the body ultimately cannot be halted even if the narrator had ‘iselde’ [discretion] (15/Ω16), as ‘Elde me is bistolen on ar Ich hit iwiste’ [Old age is stolen upon me before I

---

603 Suzannah Biernhoff, *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages* (Basingstoke, 2002), 23
605 A similar idea of the imprisoned soul can be found in ‘Discourse on Psalm cxix. 110’: ‘and þe lichame þe sholde ben þe soule hihtliche bure, makeð hire to ateliche qartene. [and he maketh the the body, that ought to be the soul’s joyous chamber a horrible prison for her] (Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 213).
knew it] (17/Ω18). The audience is, once again, returned to an inescapable movement toward the grave.

Guerric of Igny, the twelfth-century Cistercian Abbot,\textsuperscript{608} states that ‘we dwell to be sure in houses of clay, but what are of clay by reason of their material, come to be ivory through the virtue of continence.’\textsuperscript{609} The body as ‘ivory’ is a reference to the post-resurrection body, but it is the idea of ‘the virtue of continence’ that is relevant to the idea of the worldly body at this point.

The mortification of the flesh is, as Biernoff argues, ‘one of the most enduring images of medieval Christianity’, with the flesh serving as ‘an expression and externalisation of the debased human condition, bearing the hereditary imprint of sexuality and death’.\textsuperscript{610} The body, represented in the\textit{ Conduct of Life} by the ageing process, illness and mortality, is, as discussed previously, ultimately tied in to original sin and to the Fall: as in Guerric’s passage from ‘clay’ to ‘ivory’, the earthly is juxtaposed with the heavenly. However, the idea of living according to Augustine’s ‘inner man’ in the twelfth century ‘does not require the renunciation of the body, or of sensation, but their subjugation – or perhaps sublimation – to intellectual and spiritual goals.’\textsuperscript{611}

Augustine, and consequently Bernard and the later medieval thinkers, did not conceive of the bodily sense organs as inherently bad: they were only harmful ‘when the inner sense fails to control them.’\textsuperscript{612} Similarly, the lack of ‘iselðe’ [discretion] (15/Ω16) shown by the narrator of the\textit{ Conduct of Life}, is a result of a spiritual immaturity or ‘chilce’ [childishness] (7/Ω7). Therefore, when the preacher states, ‘Þe mu[c]hel folʒeð his iwil, himselfen he biswicað’ [He who excessively follows his will, he deceives himself] (14/Ω14), he is ascribing to the soul a level of culpability that is, at the very least, commensurate with that demonstrated by the body. It would seem then that

\textsuperscript{608} An introduction to Guerric and his sermons can be found in Monks of Mount Saint Bernard Abbey (eds. and trans.), \textit{Guerric of Igny: Liturgical Sermons} (Spencer, Massachusetts, 1970), pp. vii-lxi.
\textsuperscript{610} Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{611} Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment}, p. 24.
the views of the author of the *Conduct of Life* concerning the roles of the soul and body are in
general agreement with Augustine, that his emphasis on the degeneration of the body might be
viewed as a punishment for sin, and that the responsibility for this degeneration lies ultimately –
although, perhaps, not completely – with the soul.

Following from this, as Eugene Vance states, ‘the inner sense, in turn, is not bad either, so
long as it remains subordinate to the higher faculty of reason.’613 A good example of how this
complex relationship between body and soul is structured for a medieval audience is explicated in
the early thirteenth-century homily *Sawles Ward* of MS Bodley 34.614 ‘Sawles Ward’, based on the
parable found in Mark 24: 43, builds upon the metaphor of a house (the body) which is under attack
from the vices, who want to gain access to the precious treasure (the soul) contained within.
However, the house is under the stewardship of the house–lord (Reason), who has to control his wife
(Will), and his servants (the five senses) who are eager ‘to cwemen wel þe husewife ȝæin godes
wille’ [to please well the house-wife against God’s will].

The house–lord must regularly chastise his wife and servants for leaving the house
unguarded. However, the house–lord is assisted in watching over the servants by God’s four
daughters, the four cardinal virtues: ‘warschippe’ [Prudence]; ‘gastelich strengðe’ [Spiritual Strength]; ‘
meað’ [Moderation]; and ‘rihtwisnesse’ [Righteousness]. The protection of the house is ultimately
secured by Prudence (the door keeper). Prudence allows in two messengers. The first is Fear
(messenger of death), who reminds them that death’s ‘wune is to cumen bi stale ferliche and
unmundlunge hwen me least weneð’ [custom is to come by stealth, suddenly and unexpectedly,
when one least expects]; she also describes Hell and encourages them to be more steadfast. The
second messenger is ‘Love of Life’ who, by describing Heaven, drives out the despair caused by Fear’s
descriptions of a sudden death and Hell. ‘Sawles Warde’ elucidates, through the allegory of the

614 Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* (1867), pp. 244–67. See also Emily Rebekah Huber and Elizabeth
Robertson (eds.) *The Katherine Group MS Bodley 34* (Kalamazoo, MI, 2016), pp. 249–66.
castle, the complex relationship (the fractured self) between Body, Soul, Will, the senses, Reason, and God.

‘Sawles Warde’ is part of a set of texts collectively known as the Katherine Group. These texts, along with the Ancrene Wisse, with which MS Bodley 34 is also closely associated, have a common interest in the experience of the female spiritual, and a focus upon how the female might protect her virginity. They are a set of didactic texts imagined and composed to give contemplative spiritual guidance to the individual in the face of external threats to both body and soul.

Guidance or Reason, for a twelfth- and thirteenth-century audience, is found through God; this reveals itself for the author of the Conduct of Life, and consequently for the text’s audiences, as the difference between the ‘brode strate’ [broad street] (345/Ω357), which is ‘ure wil’ [our will] (345/Ω357), and the ‘narewe pað’ [narrow path] (349/Ω361), which is ‘Godes has’ [God’s bidding] (349/Ω361). The narrow path is walked by ‘þo þe hem silded ʒierne wið achen undeawe’ [they that shield themselves well from every vice] (350/Ω362) and ‘goð uneaðe azien þe cluie and azien þe heie hulle’ [go with difficulty along the cliffs and along the high hills] (351/Ω363). The idea of ‘shielding’ oneself against external influences is a recurring message of the Conduct of Life. This reflects contemporaneous concerns that divine and demonic beings, acting ‘upon the perceptive life of the inner sense’, could provoke bodily sensations from outside the soul, thus requiring a shield.

The ‘sublimation’ of the bodily senses, therefore, grants the individual a way to achieve spiritual accession. In Estote Fortes in Bello, found in Trinity, we see this most overtly in the extended use of military language to describe the necessarily repressive relationship of soul over body, if salvation is to be successfully achieved:

&liehame winneð togenes þe gost. and þe gost togenes þe lichame. and swo fliten and winnen bitwenen hem. þat al þat is on ulen and uqueme. hit is þat

65 The other texts are: The Martyrdom of Sancte Katerine [The Martyrdom of Saint Katherine]; The Liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Margarete [The Life and Passion of Saint Margaret]; The Liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Juliene [The Life and Passion of Saint Juliana]; and Hali Meithhad [Holy Maidenhood].

The body warreth against the spirit and the spirit against the body, and so strive and contend with one another, so that all that is hateful and displeasing to the one is pleasing to the other. And in this conflict each man is strong who subdueth the body and restraineth his will and adorneth his soul and performeth her will.

Indeed, drawing on thirteenth-century anthologies of model sermons used by Franciscan preachers, David D’Avray highlights that there was a ‘widespread tendency to emphasize the positive significance of the body’. Similarly, Bynum argues that ‘flesh functioned as an ‘instrument of ‘salvation’, not an obstacle to salvation’, although it should be noted, as Biernoff does, that the part that the flesh takes in redemption and spiritual resurrection comes from its desire to transgress. In *Sermo in Marcum viii. 34*, found in Trinity, the cross that the individual sinner is exhorted to bear is his own body. The substitution of the cross – normally a symbol for Christ’s own bodily suffering, death and resurrection – for the body suggests that the individual must necessarily go through bodily hardship and death before physical and spiritual resurrection. This is achieved physically in the sermon by fasting:

That is lichames helsing. Mannes lichame ihalsneð iwis. þenne me hine pined mid hunger. and mid þurste. and mid wecche. and mid swinche. and mid stiue wedes next þe liche and smerte smiten of smale longe gerden. and mid michele chele oðer wile. þos roden moten beren alle sinfulle men. þe wile mice habben of here sinnes.

[that is, leanness of body (flesh); man’s body is truly emaciated when he is tormented by hunger, by thirst, by vigils, by labour, by stiff garments next to the body, and when he is smartly smitten by slender long switches, and sometimes by great cold. These crosses must all men bear who will have mercy for their sins].

---
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The body, therefore, becomes a means of redemption through the imagery of the cross and the *Scala peccatorium* ‘that is sinful manne leddre. þe hi shulen one stien to heuene’ [that is, the ladder of sinful men by which they shall ascend into heaven].

In *Sermo in Marcum viii. 34*, in addition to the ‘lichamliche rode’ [bodily cross] the sinner must also ‘carry’ the ‘göstliche rode’ [spiritual cross]. This is, ‘herte sor for mannes ogene sinne and reuðe for his emcristenes wowe’ ['heart-sorrow' for one's own sins and pity for one's fellow-Christian’s woe]. This is followed by a discussion of the five senses as the entrance point of such sin through action and through thought, and an exhortation to individual repentance. Redemption, for a Middle English audience required the regulation, control or enclosure of the senses.

However, while it would be inaccurate to argue that the link between sin and illness (and the degeneration of the body) had not already been made before this period, and it is probable that the author of the *Conduct of Life* was using this link to emphasise the consequences of a sinful life, the twelfth-century emphasis upon the denial of the body also gave the individual a way and a means to achieve salvation. In the lines 334-340/Ω346-Ω352 of the *Conduct of Life* the devil attacks through intoxication:

```
Bute we wurðen us iwar þis wereld us wile drenchen,  
Mast alle men ʒieueð drinken of on euele senche;
```

621 Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 207
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623 Hill states that:

> The belief is widespread in OE literature that the devil, through his arrows, afflicts Mankind with sinful thoughts and physical illness, and that the trials of the mind and body are directly related to the sins of the flesh.' (Hill, 'The twelfth-century "Conduct of Life"', p. 118.)

Inversely, in the Old English saints' lives the failure of the body to decay post mortem was a sign of a successful spiritual life. Daniell and Thompson state in relation to St Cuthbert that:

> ‘Ælfric sees sin as only one of many causes of illness, although he understands disease and cure both as coming ultimately from God.’ (Victoria Thompson, *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 96). She says of Wulfstan's approach to illness, which is based on the Book of Job, that, ‘disease may be a measure of virtue as easily as sin’. (Thompson, *Dying and Death*, p. 97) By the later medieval period it would seem that this association was more developed.
Themes of eating and drinking, gluttony and indulgence are a major presence in the text of the *Conduct of Life*. They are representative of the earthly and therefore the transient, and they are linked to the body rather than to the soul. The sin is therefore to concentrate on ‘þis wereld’ [this world] (334/Ω346) that ‘us wile drenchen’ [will intoxicate us] and by doing so to drink ‘of on euele senche’ [of an evil draught] (335/Ω347). Lines such as ‘Betere is wori water þan atter imengd mid wine.’ [Better is dirty water than poison mixed with wine] (144/Ω 151) advocate a belief in self-denial that may be viewed as asceticism. To imbibe ‘wori water’ [dirty water] is to place the sanctity of the soul above the well-being of the body. The poison that is mingled with wine will corrupt the soul and must be shielded against. The narrator states that ‘Mid almesse, mid fasten and mid ibeden werie we us wid senne,’ [With alms, with fasts, with prayer let us defend ourselves from sin] (339/Ω351). This again suggests a penitential practice that places an emphasis on the denial of the body.

**Sight**

To return to Lines 17-18/Ω18-Ω19 of the *Conduct of Life*, where it is stated, ‘Elde me is bistolen on ar Ich hit iwiste | Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste’ [Old age is stolen upon me before I knew it, | I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist]. Hill believes that the ‘smeche’ [smoke] and ‘miste’ [mist] of line 18/Ω19 ‘probably refer figuratively to the blinding of the sight by affection for the fleshly sins of this world’ and cites an extract from *Gregory’s Dialogue* to validate
her point. Significantly, Psalm 6:8 states, ‘turbatus est a furore oculus meus inveteravi inter omnes inimicos meus’ [My eye is troubled through indignation: I have grown old amongst all my enemies]. This portrayal of an individual struggling to achieve salvation, and the trope of the eye as a conduit through which sin enters the human subject, chimes closely with the **Conduct of Life**.

Psalm 6 also draws a parallel between sight and old age; it states:

miserere mei Domine quoniam infirmus sum sana me Domine quoniam conturbata sunt ossa mea | et anima mea turbata est valde et tu Domine usquequo | convertere Domine eripe animam meam salvum me fac propter misericordiam tuam | quoniam non est in morte qui memor sit tui in inferno autem quis confitebitur tibi (Psalm 6:3-6)

[Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I am weak: heal me, O Lord, for my bones are troubled. | And my soul is troubled exceedingly: but thou, O Lord, how long? | Turn to me, O Lord, and deliver my soul: O save me for thy mercy’s sake. | For there is no one in death, that is mindful of thee; and who shall confess to thee in hell?]

The ultimate aim of this psalm is the salvation of the ‘troubled’ soul, as it is in the **Conduct of Life**.

The consequences of sin manifest themselves as physical ailments; the speaker’s ‘bones are troubled’; he is ‘weak’; his ‘eye is troubled’ and he has ‘grown old’. Like the narrator of the **Conduct of Life**, his repentance serves an exemplary function:

descedite a me omnes qui operamini iniquitatem quoniam exaudivit Dominus vocem fletus mei | exaudivit Dominus deprecationem meam Dominus orationem meam suscepit | erubescant et conturbentur vehementer omnes inimici mei convertantur et erubescant valde velociter (Psalm 6:9-10)

[Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity: For the Lord hath heard the voice of my weeping. | The Lord hath heard my supplication: the Lord hath received my prayer. | Let all my enemies be ashamed, and be very much troubled: let them be turned back, and be ashamed very speedily.]

As the above passages suggest, a link between sin and the degeneration of the body, including an individual’s sight, was well established long before the **Conduct of Life** was written. However, during the twelfth century one’s sense of sight became of increasing importance to medieval theological thought. Again, the motif of sight as occupying a middle ground between the

---
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body and soul, the sensual and spiritual (and partaking, therefore, in the degradation of both) derives at least partly from Augustine, who writes, 'let us use for preference the evidence of the eyes; this is the most excellent of the body’s senses, and for all its difference in kind has the greatest affinity to mental vision [visio mentis].’ In her discussion of Augustine and his influence, Biernoff argues that ‘sight was at once an extension of the sensitive soul towards an object, and the passage of sensible forms through the eye and into the brain.’ Sight, therefore, should be seen as an important link between body and soul; the ‘outer’ and ‘inner’ man; a complication in the binary – and a link between them. Vance argues that:

The body’s organs can sense nothing by themselves. For instance, sight is made possible by the bodily eye; but the act of seeing occurs only in the soul. Thus the faculty of sight, the phenomenon of seeing and the object seen are three separate and ontologically distinct components of a triad constituted by visual perception as a process.

Sight is an important part of the fractured self that, as the following discussion will attest, needs to be sublimated for fear of sin; if sublimation is achieved, however, it also grants the individual the means of obtaining spiritual union with God.

Sight as ‘an extension of the sensitive soul’ is at the same time a means of procuring spiritual knowledge and a locus for sinful desire. For as Bernard says, ‘it is sin alone which dulls and confuses the vision; nothing else seems to stand between the eye and the light, between God and man.’ In the Conduct of Life it is bodily vision that enshrouds the inner eye and leaves the narrator unable to see before him for ‘smeche’ [smoke] and ‘miste’ [mist]. The link between sight and knowledge and sight and sin is made explicit in Gerald of Wales’ thirteenth-century guide for clergy, which dictates

---

625 Biernoff, Sight and Embodiment, p. 3.
that ‘Eve would not have touched the tree […] unless she had first gazed upon it heedlessly’. This emphasis upon sublimation and enclosure is further emphasised in other post-Conquest texts, such as the Ancrene Wisse, where it is stated that ‘Hwen Þu bihaldest te mon, Þu art in Eue point: Þu lokest on Þe appel’ [when you look at the man, you are in Eve's position: you are looking at the apple]. As Biernoff argues, ‘eating the fruit becomes merely the outward sign of Eve’s disobedience […] her fate - the fate of humanity – is sealed with a look’. The guide in the Ancrene Wisse advises his readers to be ‘truly enclosed’ and be ‘blind to the outside world’, with the cloister acting like an architectural blindfold for the anchoress. As the biographer of Stephen Obazine (d. 1158) states in a discussion of the spiritual benefit of physical enclosure for the nuns at Coyroux, ‘how can one sin […] when the faculty of vision itself is enclosed? however, the idea of sight, as has been anticipated throughout this discussion, becomes more than simply the physical act of seeing, and more than a sense that requires enclosure as a prophylactic against sin. Once more, Biernoff states that:

The senses, then, are not just enclosed by the walls of a monastery or any other edifice: they can also be closed: averted from the world, turned inwards. This brings us closer to a psychological theory of enclosure, and to the possibility of being in the world while at the same time taking ‘custody of the eyes’. The enclosure and censorship of the bodily senses became a means for motivating internal or spiritual sight; Peter Limoges (d. 1306) states that ‘Man ought to shift his eye’s gaze from exterior things to interior things. In Sermo in Ps. cxxvi. 6, from Lambeth, it is stated that:

631 Biernoff, Sight and Embodiment, pp. 42-43.
632 Quoted in Biernoff, Sight and Embodiment, p. 115.
633 Quoted, with further discussion, in Biernoff, Sight and Embodiment, p. 115.
634 Biernoff, Sight and Embodiment, p. 120.
635 Peter of Limoges, De Oculo Morali, quoted in Biernoff, Sight and Embodiment, p. 123.
The righteous man, that with the eyes of his heart looks into heaven and seeth the great bliss to which he is invited, will soon long to go thitherward, and when he may not come thither as quickly as he would, he sendeth thither his hot tears.

What can and cannot be seen of Heaven in this life and the one that follows will be discussed in more detail later in this introduction, but it is important to demonstrate here, as I believe the above quotation does, that the act of ‘seeing’ could transcend the physical act; and that sight was, therefore, a sense that linked the physical world with the spiritual. The transference from ‘exterior’ to ‘interior’ spoken of by Peter Limoges is especially important during this period as a movement grew in literature and theological thought that placed a greater importance on the idea of self-examination as a means of attaining spiritual success.

It is important to note that Christianity before the twelfth century was already necessarily concerned with self-awareness and inner character as it developed into an ‘interior’ religion that required the believer to lay himself open to God and receive the Holy Spirit, resulting in an emphasis on the sin of the individual and his unworthiness. However, from the ninth century there began, according to Matsuda, a development in private penance which led to ‘a gradual shift of emphasis from penitential exercises to heartfelt repentance and auricular confession.’ Morris, in his discussion of Abelard (d. 1142), sees this as a rejection of ‘external acts’ and ‘emotional gush’ with an emphasis on true inner sorrow for sin. Furthermore, as Matsuda notes in her discussion on the development of the state of purgatory, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries there was a shift from penance, which cannot be fulfilled in this lifetime, to post-mortem punishment and penitence, further encouraging the cultivation of self-knowledge as a means of scrutinizing one’s conscience in

---
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order to understand the sin one has committed.\textsuperscript{640} This stress upon inner sorrow and self-examination led to the universal adoption of individual confession between 1000 and 1200, although it should be noted that it had already been present in some parts of the Church for centuries, with the fourth Lateran Council imposing annual confession as a minimal obligation upon every member of the Church in 1215.\textsuperscript{641}

Matsuda correlates this emphasis on self-examination and auricular confession with a ‘major literary effect’ that ultimately sees ‘the growth of the summas and manuals of confession as well as the manuals of religious instruction intended for both clergy and laity, undoubtedly assisted by the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council and of the Council of Lambeth (1281).\textsuperscript{642} More immediately, however, she also notes that ‘the essential doctrine of confession and penance defined between 1070 and 1170 began to be adopted into the lives of ordinary people after 1170 through sermons and other didactic and homiletic treatises’.\textsuperscript{643} This striving through self-examination for self-knowledge, which sees the adoption of ‘confession and penance’ into ‘sermons and other didactic and homiletic treatises’, also results in what Morris calls a ‘desire for self-expression’. He states that ‘[w]e hear the authentic voice of the individual, speaking of his own desires and experiences. ...[O]ne field in which this [desire for self-expression] now became apparent was the sermon’, agreeing with Matsuda that there was a ‘huge increase both in the preaching and in the preservation of sermons’ in the period from 1050-1200.\textsuperscript{644}

One might go further than Morris does here, and note that the audience does not just ‘hear the authentic voice of the individual’, but also sees him in the Conduct of Life – whether that is physically, as the speaker stands before his audience, or meditatively, as the audience is encouraged

\textsuperscript{640} Matsuda, Death and Purgatory, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{641} Morris, The Discovery of the Individual, p. 73. See also Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth, p. 198, who states that ‘it is also clear that the requirement of annual confession in 1215 was, in a sense, nothing new: frequent confession had been recommended for centuries, and authors urged that if possible people should make confessions more frequently than only once a year.’
\textsuperscript{642} Matsuda shows that it was this adoption that sees ‘Latin treatises on self-knowledge as pseudo-Bernardian Meditaciones piisimae de cognition humanae conditionis, which was originally written for a monastic audience in the twelfth century, grew popular in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries’. (Matsuda, Death and Purgatory, p. 23).
\textsuperscript{643} Matsuda, Death and Purgatory, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{644} Morris, The Discovery of the Individual, p. 67.
to contemplate the words on the page and the pictorial quality of each image with what Biernoff calls ‘the medieval proclivity for looking beyond – literally seeing through – the sensible world to a parallel realm of unchanging and universal truths’.\textsuperscript{645} Although bodily sight should necessarily be enclosed or regulated (taken custody of), ‘spiritual vision’ requires the individual to approach spiritual truths through the material world and corporeal sight; bodily sight is therefore legitimised as a ‘necessary means to an immaterial, invisible end’.\textsuperscript{646}

This ‘approach’ can be typified during this period by the emphasis upon the devotional image – specifically, an encouragement for the individual to meditate on the wounds of Christ and upon the Passion.\textsuperscript{647} Redemption is achieved through the ‘flesh’ of an increasingly human incarnate figure of Christ and the idea of vision itself.\textsuperscript{648} Vision, meditation and contemplation were used as a means to associate oneself with the nature of Christ’s sufferings and an emergence of the idea of a closer more personal relationship with Christ and God. As Morris argues:

\begin{quote}
The movement towards a more inward and compassionate devotion, in which the individual strove imaginatively to share in the pain of his Lord, became really strong in the eleventh century, and in the twelfth it governed much of the thought about the passion.\textsuperscript{649}
\end{quote}

This emphasis upon the personal relationship with God can be seen in the representation of what happened to the individual post-mortem and specifically the treatment of the Last Judgement. The twentieth century theologian and Jesuit Priest Henri de Lubac says of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries:

\begin{quote}
The collective eschatology and the expectation of the final resurrection, whose outline was once so clear, are fading away. Within a framework which is still in general that of the church, the attention of the faithful is fixed less on the destiny of the church than on the destiny of each believer.\textsuperscript{650}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{645} Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment}, p. 125.
\textsuperscript{646} Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{647} Discussed in detail in Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment}, pp. 133-64.
\textsuperscript{648} Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{649} Morris, \textit{The Discovery of the Individual}, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{650} Quoted in Morris, \textit{The Discovery of the Individual}, p. 146.
This is not to say that the idea of the Last Judgement was abandoned, which is certainly not the case, but that there appears to be a significant shift away from an approach that focuses on a general audience to one that accommodates an emphasis on the individual and the answers that each must make. The \textit{Conduct of Life} might well be read as a text which represents precisely this transformation.

\textbf{Judgement, Purgation and Intercession}

After the first fifty lines of the \textit{Conduct of Life} there is a movement outward from personal reflection to a generalised diatribe on the transient nature of life and earthly goods. Maxims such as, ‘Eðlate him ware al wele and erðeliche blisse | For to þe muchele blisse cume, þis murie mis iwisse.’ [Worthless to him were all joy and earthly bliss, | For to come to that great bliss (heaven) is mirth indeed] (155-156/Ω162-Ω163) that express the transient nature of life that ‘þe longe ne mai ilaste’ [which may not last long] (319/Ω330) are reminiscent of the Old English poetic tradition. Similarly, indebtedness to Anglo-Saxon writings might also be seen in the scene of Judgement that follows this in the \textit{Conduct of Life}. Foxhall-Forbes states, in relation to \textit{Blickling Homily V}, that:

\begin{quote}
The Last Judgement, at which the good and the wicked would finally be divided and placed in heaven and hell until the end of time, was one of the most popular topics of discussion amongst ecclesiastical authors in early medieval England, especially among the later Anglo-Saxon homilists.
\end{quote}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{652}Morris, \textit{The Discovery of the Individual}, p. 146. \textsuperscript{652}Foxhall-Forbes, \textit{Heaven and Earth}, p. 129}
The *Conduct of Life* does not contain a description of the last days or the coming of the Antichrist nor does it parallel contemporary events with the signs that Judgement Day is imminent, motifs found in many Old English texts; rather, the sermon concentrates on the scene of individual judgement. Mecklenburg and Mertens argue that:

The view on the Judgement underwent considerable development in the course of the Middle Ages. A distinction came to be made between a general Last Judgement, at the end of time, of all those living or dead, and a particular judgement of every individual upon death. In general terms, emphasis shifted from the general Last Judgement to the particular Judgement.

Scenes of individual judgement are also present in Old English literature: they can be found in *Vercelli Homily II* and *Vercelli Homily X*, amongst others, where it is the devil who acts as the accuser and prosecutor on Judgement Day. Furthermore, the idea of the Judgement being played out like a court-room drama also has antecedent in Old English literature, most notably in *Vercelli Homily IV*, which is unique in that the post-judgement address of the soul to the body is dramatized in sensuous language in front of crowds of men, angels and demons. Similarly, in the *Conduct of Life* we find the lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Þar sulle ben deflen swo fele þat willeð us forwreien,} \\
\text{Nabbeð hie no þing forþetan of þat hie her iseien,} \\
\text{Al þat hie iseien her hie willeð cuðen þare,} \\
\text{Bute we haben hit ibet þe hwile we here waren.}
\end{align*}
\]

---

653 For example, Homily XV of the Vercelli Codex contains a description of the last days; Ælfric’s preface to his first series of Catholic homilies contains a scene that portrays the coming of the antichrist; and parallels between contemporary events and the signs that Judgement Day is imminent can be found in Ælfric’s Homily for the second Sunday in advent, which is based on St Gregory, where he claims that the earthquakes, hunger and pestilence are present in the world although the astronomical signs are yet to come, and in Wulfstan’s *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* where Wulfstan contends that the Viking attacks, which reached their peak in 1014, were divine retribution for the sins of the English nation.


655 Mecklenburg and Mertens elucidate in their study the various ways that the scenes of particular judgement are depicted in medieval literature with examples given of popular motifs of ‘testing’ divided into: ‘the journey’, ‘the weighing of good and bad works upon scales’, ‘the book of life’ and ‘the bridge’. They cite the earliest example of the devil as an opponent in a trial being from Caesarius of Arles (d.542). (Mecklenburg and Mertens, pp. xiv-xviii).

656 See Thompson, *Dying and Death*, p. 196.
Al hie habbeð on here write þat we misduden here þeih we hes ne niseien hie waren ure iferen. (97-102/Ω100-Ω105)
[There shall be so many devils that will accuse us;
They have not forgotten anything of what they have seen here
All that they have seen here they will make known there.
Except we have repented it the while we were here.
They have all in their writing that we did wrong here,
Though we did not see them, they were our companions.]

Indeed, the early part of this scene is reminiscent of a legal court-room with the presence of ‘ængles’ [angels] (94/Ω96) who shall be in dread and the ‘deflen’ [devils] (97/Ω100) who will act as accusers with all of the sins of the individual written down (101/Ω104). However, in the Conduct of Life, although the accusations may be made by many devils, the Judgement will ultimately be an individual act, since ‘Elch man sal þar biclepien himselfen and ec demen.’ [Each man shall accuse and also condemn himself there] (107/Ω112). The scene continues with its legal imagery in the next line, where it states that ‘His oʒen werc and his þanc to witnesse he sal temen.’ [His own works and his thoughts for a witness he shall call.] (108/Ω113). The difference now is that the audience feels that the court-room has been closed off as the narrator re-establishes the personal relationship with God that infuses much of the text. The author moves from the inclusive pronoun ‘we’, through the rhetorical questions that establish a multitude of sinners, who will inevitably be damned, to the individual who ‘sal himselfen demen to deaðe oðer to liue’ [shall sentence himself to death or to life] (115/Ω120). The narrator acts as a guide, accompanying the audience only so far before, ultimately, leaving them alone to face God. He makes himself present at key moments, guiding the audience through the theology before withdrawing when the choices that are to be made are of an individual nature.

As has been demonstrated, scenes of individual judgement were frequently found before the twelfth century and can be partly attributed to the belief, in line with the New Testament, that the
good and the bad did not stay together after death. Therefore, the soul faced ‘an individual judgement immediately upon leaving the body’, with this being, as Foxhall-Forbes writes, ‘only a foretaste of the fate to come after the Last Judgement’. However, by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, scenes of the General Judgement are greatly reduced in number. According to Veronica O’Mara’s study of chiliastic literature, it is not possible to speak of ‘original’ twelfth- and thirteenth-century sermons dealing with the Last Judgement. O’Mara demonstrates that whilst ‘some of the notions survive intact, overall the way in which the Judgement is used in Middle English is different’, concluding that ‘[t]he most striking difference is that it is not dealt with as explicitly as in Old English, where we had a whole homily called “The End of this World is Nigh” and others labelled Die iudicii.

O’Mara believes that the decline in ‘overt judgement preaching’ is linked to changes in the pattern of preaching that sees a shift in importance from Rogationtide (which is associated with preaching about the Last Judgement) in Old English to a stress on Advent, Lent and Easter in Middle English. Furthermore, she contends that Middle English preachers ‘did not always need to engage in full descriptions of the events’ because such details were already known to audiences through other texts, plays and wall paintings and consequently the Middle English homilist could easily reference the Last Judgement without full description.

Whilst O’Mara’s argument is important, the reduction in the number of sermons that contain descriptions of the Last Judgement can also be seen as resulting from a more inward devotion which focused upon the importance of the destiny of the individual as opposed to the general throng. In this respect the point at which the individual dies becomes the decisive moment

---

657 Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xiv.
658 Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth, p. 201.
659 Veronica O’Mara points to only one ME sermon that is ‘explicitly devoted to the four Last Things: Sermon of Dead Men’. (Veronica O’Mara, ‘The Last Judgement in Medieval English Prose Sermons: An Overview’ in Mertens et al. (eds.), The Last Judgement in Medieval Sermons, 19-44, p. 25).
661 O’Mara, ‘The Last Judgement’, p. 27, p. 36.
rather than the idea of a general resurrection. For instance, Morris observes that, at this time, while
the Last Judgement was not denied, ‘attention was concentrated upon one’s personal answer and
personal hope of heaven’.\footnote{Morris, The Discovery of the Individual, p. 147.} As a result the deathbed became more important in the later medieval
period and dying became an art (artes moriendi).\footnote{Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xviii.}

Similarly, as I argue above, the Conduct of Life does not contain scenes of General
Judgement. Instead, in keeping with the remainder of the sermon, the focus remains on the ultimate
issue of choices made in this life (before death) through the scene of individual judgement, the
individual’s relationship with God, and ultimately the abodes of Hell and Heaven – entry to which
is premised on the quality, good or bad, of the individual’s death. Mecklenburg and Mertens argue
that tropes of Judgement developed in such a way that it was ‘increasingly seen as an instrument to
compel people to live a virtuous life’,\footnote{Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xxv.} and that ‘one’s own death has a more realistic and
immediate quality than the supposedly distant day of the General Judgement. […] For this reason,
the emphasis shifted from the general Last Judgement to a particular judgement’.\footnote{Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xxv.}

The conclusion to the section that is given over to Judgement Day in the Conduct of Life
states that ‘Are deað and dom cumēd to his dure, he maiʒ him sore adrade’ [Ere death and judgement
come to his door, he may be sore afraid] (124/Ω129). Death and Judgement are simultaneous for the
audiences of the Conduct of Life. The emphasis for the author of the Conduct of Life is on the
actions of the individual in this life. He urges them to repent before it is ‘wel late’ [too late] (127/
Ω132). The transience of earthly belongings is also emphasised in this section: the narrator states
‘Hwat sulle we beren us biforen, mid hwan sulle we iqueme, | We þe nafre god ne duden, þan
hevenliche Deme?’ [What shall we bear before us, with what shall we please (God), | We that never
did good, to (please) the heavenly Judge?] (95-96/Ω98-Ω99). There is no answer to this question as
he affirms that, ‘Þanne þe deað is at þe dure, wel late he biddeð ore’ [When death is at the door, too

662 Morris, The Discovery of the Individual, p. 147.
663 Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xviii.
664 Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xxv.
665 Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xxv.
late he prays for forgiveness] (127/Ω132). Death’s finality, in this sermon, becomes an argument for the necessity of repentance while life endures.

However, following the early Christian period, when it was considered that the end of time and the resurrection of the dead were imminent, the question of where souls spent their time between death and the general resurrection underwent considerable revision. Matsuda states that ‘the concept of Purgatory reached a more or less fully developed form sometime in the eleventh or twelfth century, and was gradually adopted by the laity in the following centuries,’\(^\text{666}\) with it being the subject of a conciliar statement at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. Matsuda also agrees, however, with the critics of Le Goff who contend that the concept of purgatory preceded its theological formalisation, and cites Southern’s argument that ‘the noun was introduced in the twelfth century simply for the sake of convenience […] the real growth of the doctrine may be found a century earlier than the date set by Le Goff.’\(^\text{667}\) In fact, texts that discuss an \textit{interim} between death and Judgement Day are found from the second century;\(^\text{668}\) Foxhall-Forbes notes the appearance of conceptualisations of purgatory in Bede, Gregory of Tours, and the writings of Augustine and Gregory the Great’s \textit{Dialogues}.\(^\text{669}\) From the second century the question was not


\(^{667}\) Matsuda, \textit{Death and Purgatory}, p. 5. Le Goff believed that Purgatory was ‘born’ towards the end of the twelfth century when it received the name ‘purgatorium’. Le Goff also conceptualised it as a place rather than a state. For a detailed account of the development of Purgatory according to Le Goff, including the emergence of Purgatory in the twelfth century as a specific place, see Jacques Le Goff, \textit{The Birth of Purgatory}, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (London, 1984). See also Foxhall-Forbes, \textit{Heaven and Earth}, p. 203.

\(^{668}\) Mecklenburg and Mertens (p. xix) argue that:

Terullian (d. after 220) refers to this time inbetween death and the Last Judgement as an \textit{interim}. In a discussion of the parable of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16. 19-31), he calls Lazarus’s sojourn in the bosom of Abraham the \textit{interim refrigerium} (the invigorating interim), while he describes that of the rich man as an \textit{interim tormentum} (an interim of torment).

\(^{669}\) Foxhall-Forbes, \textit{Heaven and Earth}, p. 203. Matsuda, \textit{Death and Purgatory}, (p. 5ff) similarly examines many earlier examples of the interim and charts their development through to a more fully realised conception of Purgatory, including: \textit{Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas} (c.203), Drythelm in Bede’s \textit{Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum} (731), \textit{Visio Wettini} (824), the 9th century \textit{Visio Karoli Crassi}, Gervaise of Tilbury’s \textit{Otia imperialis} (1212-1214), Jacobus de Voragine’s \textit{Legenda Aures} (c.1250), and the twelfth-century \textit{Visio Tungdali} and \textit{Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii}. Matsuda argues that the early descriptions of the interim were for Le Goff, ‘only an imperfect shadow of the doctrine of Purgatory when judged against its fully developed form.’ Charting the early development of the interim, and later Purgatory, Matsuda writes that ‘[a]lthough there is no explicit biblical reference to Purgatory, the passage in 1 Corinthians 3.10-15 where it is stated ‘ipse autem salvus erit sic tamen quasi per ignem’ (3.15) was traditionally interpreted as referring to the idea of purification by fire after death.’ (Matsuda, \textit{Death and Purgatory}, p. 6, p. 6ff).
whether a purging of the soul occurred at all after death, 'but rather when and how this purification took place, at the Last Judgement or immediately after death'.

During the Anglo-Saxon period the fate of the soul post-mortem was clearly of concern to both lay and religious men and women. Foxhall-Forbes argues that although there are ‘only a few Anglo-Saxon texts which explore Purgatory and the interim as significant topics in their own right, [...] there are frequent references to the fate of the soul in the interim and the purging of sins after death, even if these are not discussed in so much detail (or so obsessively) as was the Last Judgement’.671

However, the shift in emphasis from the general to the individual judgement raised questions as to the doctrine of the reunification of body and soul. As concerns about the purgative punishments enacted upon the soul between the two judgements developed, an ‘organised system of intercession’, which exploited the traditional practice of praying for the dead, was established and ‘performed by the living for the benefit of the dead as well as for themselves’.672 Matsuda points to the Visio Sancti Pauli as a text that evidences an early ‘idea of penance after death and its alleviation by intercession [...] in the idea of the Sunday respite’.673 By the seventh century, Isidore of Saville (d.636) adduced the purgation of sin in the post-mortem interim between death and the Last Judgement as a ‘catholic’ belief, ‘in the sense that it was held universally’,674 with communal commemoration and prayer for the dead growing in significance within religious communities throughout the early Middle Ages.675 In addition, from the ninth century onwards there is growing evidence of commemoration through special prayers, masses and almsgiving for those who had

---

670 Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth, p. 204.
672 Matsuda, Death and Purgatory, p. 2. Foxhall-Forbes argues that, ‘Prayer for the dead is found in early Jewish and Christian thought, perhaps without connection to the interim, but it still looks to a future time and is bound up with a desire for the forgiveness of sin.’ (Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth, p. 205).
673 The long Latin version was written no later than the early sixth century with the shorter redactions extant in manuscripts from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. (Matsuda, Death and Purgatory, p. 36)
674 Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth, p. 206.
675 Foxhall-Forbes points to correspondences that passed between men and women in religious life, ‘asking for masses and prayers to be said for each other or – more importantly in this context – for their dead friends and relatives’, as increasing evidence of the importance of intercession. (Foxhall-Forbes, Heaven and Earth, p. 211).
recently died, and special arrangements being made for liturgical commemorations through writs, wills, charters, and so on.\textsuperscript{676}

However, the author of the \textit{Conduct of Life} does not make a distinction between death and Doomsday. He does not state that there will be a double judgement; one at death and then a second at the world’s end, and he does not make mention of any form of interim paradise between the time of death and Doomsday or of any means of post-mortem intercession. The text does not advocate the giving of gifts for the souls of the dead and the author does not recommend either the usual role of intercessional prayers in aiding the individual during the period between death and Doomsday. However, when viewed in the context of the sermon as a whole all of this is not so surprising.

It might be possible to read the \textit{Conduct of Life} as a text written by an author who simply did not acknowledge the existence of Purgatory or any form of interim: for example, during the Anglo-Saxon period Archbishop Wulfstan denied the possibility of interim purgation.\textsuperscript{677} However, the later date of the \textit{Conduct of Life} suggests that this is extremely unlikely as by the time of Thomas Aquinas, after the composition of the \textit{Conduct of Life}, Purgatory had long been established as ‘a place of charity and purification’ distinct from Hell where ‘purgative punishment in Purgatory can be effectively reduced by intercession by the living’,\textsuperscript{678} with an apparent acceptance that ‘practically all ordinary Christians are in turn expected to spend some time in Purgatory’.\textsuperscript{679} A much more likely explanation is that any references to post-mortem penance or intercession were deliberately excluded from the sermon as their inclusion would have been detrimental to the impact and immediacy of the text’s message.

By contrast, the transience earthly goods is given full scope as a homlietic subject. It would seem that the author takes his basic teaching from Matthew 6: 19-21, as is evident in the following lines:

\textsuperscript{676} See Foxhall-Forbes, \textit{Heaven and Earth}, pp. 213-262.
\textsuperscript{677} Foxhall-Forbes, \textit{Heaven and Earth}, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{678} See Matsuda, \textit{Death and Purgatory}, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{679} Matsuda, \textit{Death and Purgatory}, p. 23.
He deð his aihte an siker stede þe hit sent to heueriche.  
For þar ne þarf he ben ofdrad of fure ne of þieue, 
Þar ne mai hit him binime þe loðe ne þe lieuue, (42-44/Ω43-Ω45) 
[He puts his treasure in a safe place who sends it to heaven, 
For there he need not be afraid of fire nor of thief, 
There may no one deprive him of it, the enemy nor the friend.] 

The *Conduct of Life* is distinctive, however, in that it does not advocate gifts for the souls of the dead. The text is firmly situated in this life, recommending instead the giving of alms in the present:

Sende god biforen him man, þe hwile he mai, to hevene, 
For betre is on almesse biforen þan ben after seuene. (27-28/Ω28-29) 
[Man [should] send good before him, the while he may, to heaven, 
For better is one alms before than are seven after.]

Foxhall-Forbes states that Old English texts were divided as to how they represent or do not represent the state of Purgatory and the impact that intercession might have:

[H]omiletic and penitential texts underline the finality of death, and so the importance of completing penance and confession before there was no longer an opportunity for forgiveness of sins in this life, other texts witness to the high value of prayers and offerings made on behalf of the dead.\

The *Conduct of Life* falls into the first category of homiletic and penitential texts which contend that ‘even if someone only turns to God on the last day of his life, that is enough: the crucial thing is that he should attempt to atone for his sins, or even simply express the desire to do so.’ The immediacy of a response is once again reiterated in the *Conduct of Life* when the narrator states:

Forþi [is] he wis þe bit and biȝjet and bet bifoere Dome, 
Þanne þe deað is at þe dure, wel late he biddeð ore; (126-127/Ω131-Ω132) 
[Therefore he is wise that prays and obtains mercy and repents before the Doom. 
When death is at the door, too late he prays for forgiveness]

---

It would appear that the emphasis on the finality of death, found in many Old English texts, was carried over into the Early Middle English period. In this regard there are parallels between my analysis of the *Conduct of Life* and Matsuda’s research findings: both indicate that there were significant reservations about an over-reliance on purgatory and post-mortem intercession. For instance, Matsuda contends that the ‘apparent denial of any assurance of salvation to those souls who died with a grave sin’, found in Middle English visionary material such as the *Visio Tungdali*, functions as ‘a didactic device intended to warn against excessive hope in post-mortem purgation’ and to ‘bring home the importance of alms and works of charity performed before death’.\(^{682}\) As the idea of Purgatory grew, so did the fear that individuals would be over-optimistic and treat the opportunity offered by Purgatory to offset their previous sins as a substitute for acting well in this life. In both the late medieval didactic and homiletic writings on death that feature in Matsuda’s work, and the *Conduct of Life*, we can therefore observe a resistance to purgatory and an emphasis on ‘exhorting the reader to repent quickly so that he or she will be ready whenever death comes’.\(^{683}\)

According to Matsuda’s research, this is especially the case in the Middle English lyrics on death, with which the *Conduct of Life* has much in common. At the centre of these lyrics and at the centre of the *Conduct of Life* is the dualism of heaven and hell, salvation and damnation. In these lyrics, ‘[p]urgatory was acknowledged, almost grudgingly, only after due emphasis had been placed on the severity of purgative punishment there’;\(^ {684}\) in the *Conduct of Life* it is barely acknowledged.

A second point of importance in this respect is that the giving of wealth is linked in the *Conduct of Life* with the renunciation of kin. This is manifest in the lines which follow directly after those on the giving of alms quoted previously:

```
Ne bie þe leuere þan þe self þi mæi ne þi mowe,
Sot is þe is odær mannes frend betere þan his owen.
Ne hopie wif to hire were ne were to his wive,
```

\(^{682}\) Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 51.
\(^{683}\) Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 2.
Be for himself afric man þe hwile he beð aliue. (29-32/Ω30-Ω33)
[Prefer not to thyself thy kinsman nor thy kinswoman,
He is a fool that is a better friend to others than to himself.
Let no wife trust to her husband, nor husband to his wife,
Be every man for himself, the while he is alive.]

The lines within the Conduct of Life are deliberately broad and therefore inclusive of all potential audience members through the writer’s use of gnomic phrases, and yet the narrator breaks through the general to emphasise the personal message of the text. The relationship that an individual has with God is a personal one, therefore:

Do al to Gode þat he muʒe ech, þe hwile he beð aliue.
Ne lipne no man to muchel to childe ne to wiue;
Þe þe him selfe forgjet for wive oðer for childe
He sal cumen on evel stede, bute him God be milde. (23-26/Ω24-Ω27)
[Do all for God what he may, the while he is alive.
Let no man trust too much to children nor to wife (women);
He who forgets himself for wife or for child
He shall come into an evil place, unless God is merciful to him.]

Repentance and therefore salvation for a post-Conquest audience listening to the narrator of the Conduct of Life is a personal journey; the choices that are to be made are exclusive even when it comes to family. There is only one way to Heaven and that is to ‘(G)o we þane narewe pað and þene wei grene’ [Let us go the narrow path and the green way] (343/Ω355). The author uses repetition of key themes throughout the text and says once more of the sinner that, ‘Eðlate him ware wif and child, suster and fader and broðer.’ [Worthless to him were wife and child, sister and father and brother] (150/Ω157).

As has been demonstrated, the idea of individual choices is reiterated throughout the text. The emphasis for the Conduct of Life is on an individual relationship with God. This is stressed in the section concerning individual judgement and the lines throughout the text that focus on intercession; ultimately, however, it is represented most fully in the text’s portrayal of Heaven.
Heaven

Rather than relying on post-mortem intercession, the narrator of the *Conduct of Life* encourages his audiences to employ their money in worthwhile causes whilst on Earth, urging them to ‘3ieue hes for Godes luue’ [give it away for God’s love] (56/Ω57), and claiming that ‘Al he hit sal eft finde þar, and hundrefealdes more.’ [They shall find it all there again, and a hundredfold more] (54/Ω55).

Although the narrator’s description of Heaven as a financial safe-house is in itself appealing, it works because of the audience’s fears and grievances in this world. The sermon alludes to the exhortation in Matthew 6: 19-20 to lay up treasures in heaven, in the knowledge that they will be safe from this world’s insecurities:

\[
\text{For þar ne þarf he ben ofrad of fure ne of þieue, Par ne mai hit him binime þe loðe ne þe lieue,} \quad (43-44/Ω44-Ω45)
\]

[For there he need not be afraid of fire nor of thief, There may no one deprive him of it, the enemy nor the friend.]

In lines 48/Ω49 and 50/Ω51, again, we find similar threats to earthly wealth that are not present in Heaven but are reliant on the person’s actions in this life:

\[
\text{For þar ne sal me us naht binime mid wrongwise dome.} \quad (48/Ω49)
\]

[For there shall no one rob us with wrongful (unjust) judgme...]

\[
\text{For ne mai hit us binime, no king ne no syrreue.} \quad (50/Ω51)
\]

[For no one may rob us of it, no king nor sherrif.]

As is demonstrated here, the *Conduct of Life* construes Heaven as an absence of negatives; an absence, in the first instance, of earthly affliction or complaint. Cavendish proposes that descriptions of Heaven take on this use of negatives because:

Heaven is ultimately beyond the reach of imagination because it is a state of good without any admixture of evil, which is a condition foreign to human experience. As

---

685 A similar idea is found in *De Octo Uiciis & de Duodecim Abusiuis Huius Seculi* in Lambeth:

\[
\text{Eft þe ðe deleð elmessan for his drihtnes luuan þe bihut his gold hord on heouene riche. þer nan þeof ne mei [his] maðmas forsteolan, ac heo beoð bi hundfalde ihalde him þer.}
\]

[Again, he who gives alms for his Lord’s love, hides his treasure in heaven, where no thief may steal away (his) treasures, but where they shall be an hundredfold preserved for him.] (Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* (1867), p. 109).
a result, it is frequently described in negatives. In heaven there is no death, sorrow or
time, nor faith or hope, because they are no longer needed. There is no danger,
vigence, pain, disagreement or anxiety. Heaven contains only one pole of each of the
pairs of opposites which make up life on earth.\textsuperscript{686}

A good example of this is found in \textit{On God Ureisun of Ure Lefdi} in Cotton MS. Nero A xiv which
describes Heaven as a place:

\begin{quote}
Þar ham neuer ne mei. snou. ne uorst iuerden.
Þer ne mie non ualuwen. uor þer is eche sumer.
Ne non liuiinde þing woe þer nis ne þeorer.
Þer heo schulen resten þe her ðe doð wurschiphe, 
ʒif heo ʒemeð hore lif cleane urom all quedschipe.
Þer ne schulen heo ne schulen neuer karien ne swinken.
Ne weopen ne muren ne helle stenches stinken. (38-44)\textsuperscript{687}
\end{quote}

[Where never snow nor frost may hurt them,
There may none fade, for there is eternal summer.
No living thing there is weak or sorrowful.
There they shall rest who here do honour thee,
If they keep their life clean from evil;
There they shall never sorrow nor toil,
Nor weep, nor mourn, nor hell-stinks smell.]

We can also see this manifested in the lines of the \textit{Conduct of Life} when the narrator says that ‘Ne
mai non euel ne non wane ben in Godes riche,’ [No evil nor want may be In God’s kingdom] (359/ 
Ω372).

As has been seen, the \textit{Conduct of Life} places a particular emphasis on the transitory nature
of earthly life and on wealth. These things are absent from the abode of the blessed. As the earliest
part of this introduction has shown (pp. 210-230), the physical degeneration of the body in life is
essential to an understanding of the \textit{Conduct of Life} – especially in the description of the narrator,
who is suffering from the harsh realities of old age. It is, therefore, not surprising that, in order to
convey the didactic message of the sermon, Heaven is described in terms that negate this process.
The narrator states: ‘Þar is ʒieuð abuten elde and hale abuten unhalðe, | Nis þar særeþe ne sor, non ne

\textsuperscript{687} Morris, \textit{Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises} (1867), p. 193.
nafre unisalðe’ [There is youth without old age, and health without sickness, | There is no sorrow
nor suffering, nor ever unhappiness](377-378/Ω390-Ω391).

Once more, and finally, the appearance of the narrator is at the didactic core of the sermon, since he is the physical manifestation of what Heaven is not, whilst simultaneously engaged in making apparent what Heaven will be. Paradoxically, the rewards for the soul in heaven can only be described through the language and imagery of the absent body. 688 The didactic message is built upon contrast between this world and the next – a descriptive technique common to portrayals of Heaven, as will be shown. Ronald E. Pepin notes that Bernard’s depictions are similarly built around contrasting the joys of heaven with the tears of this world – ‘nunc tibi tristia, tunc tibi gaudia’ [now you have sorrows, then you will have joys] – and argues that ‘there is nothing unique about Bernard’s depiction of celestial bliss. His material is drawn from conventional lore about heaven as found in sacred scripture and in writers who preceded him in the tradition’. 689 It is a formula that is maintained in the homiletic tradition of the post-Conquest period – with a very good example of a similar descriptive passage concerning heaven to the one found in the Conduct of Life, which relies upon contrast between the earthly and the celestial, found in In Die Dominica of Lambeth:

þer scal beon worldwunne þ wið-uten pouerte. fulle þ wið-uten hungre.
hele þ wið-uten unhele. reste þ wið-uten swinge. blisse þ wið-uten sarinesse.
Iþæð þ wið-uten elde. Lokinge þ wið-uten winkunge. song þ wið-uten
lisse. smellinge þ mid swetnesse. and dunge þ wið-uten þungunge. 690
[There shall be worldly weal without poverty, fullness without hunger, health without infirmity, rest without toil, bliss without sorrow, youth without old age, sight without sleepiness, song without cessation, smelling with sweetness, and service without weariness.]

688 Jan Swango Emerson makes similar observations about Marcus’ description of Tundale. She states that ‘Marcus cannot explain the nature of the other-world body with which he is so fascinated. He admits that the experiences he describes are so remarkable he must utilize imagery to help us, who are still bound by our earthly bodies, to understand.’ (Jan Swango Emerson, ‘Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses in the Vision of Tundal’, in Jan Swango Emerson and Hugh Feiss (eds.), Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays (New York, 2000), 3-46, p. 11).
690 Morris 1867, pp. 143-145.
In line 373/Ω386 of the *Conduct of Life* the narrator, still maintaining his descriptions through the use of negation of what is harsh in this world, states that, ‘Par is wele abuten wane and reste abuten swunche.’ [There is joy without want, and rest without toil.] The idea of Heaven being a place of ‘reste’ is common in such descriptions, as it is in *On God Ureisun of Ure Lefdi* and *In Die Dominica*. It is ultimately linked with the idea of the eternal Sabbath and such New Testament lines as Revelation 14: 13. In Hebrews 4: 4 the link is made between the eternal rest of the blessed and the Book of Genesis, stating, ‘dixit enim quondam loco de die septima sic et requievit Deus die septima ab omnibus operibus suis’ [For in a certain place he spoke of the seventh day thus: And God rested the seventh day from all his works]. A similar rest is then promised to those who qualify for Heaven in Hebrews 4: 9-10.

The link between the story of Creation and that of the Apocalypse is significant. It is through the fall of Adam, which takes place in the Book of Genesis, that the transitory afflictions of an earthly life, described in the *Conduct of Life*, were brought about. Heaven is often described in terms that are reminiscent of Eden. This is because Eden is an idealised earthly paradise and a place of human happiness and innocence. Cavendish makes a more specific link between the fall of Adam and the idea of hard labour:

Although Adam is put in Eden ‘to till and keep it’, the story implies that his work was easy and pleasant, for when God expels Adam and Eve from the garden for eating the forbidden fruit, Adam is condemned to hard agricultural labour, to which he had evidently been a stranger before. A good example of how the Fall is represented as imposing labour and toil upon Adam (and resultantly all mankind), from a contemporary manuscript, is found in ‘De Initio Creature’, an adapted version of Ælfric’s *First Series of Homilies [Catholic Homilies I]: De Initio Creaturae*, where God says to Adam:

---

691 Paul draws here on Genesis 2: 2.
Although the *Conduct of Life* does not describe Heaven in physical details that are reminiscent of Eden, it does lay a particular emphasis on the rest that will be achieved there by those who qualify. The author of the *Conduct of Life* also makes the link between Adam’s first sin and the ailments of life. It is worth repeating here Lines 197-200/Ω204-Ω207 and contrasting them with the two lines that follow (201-202/Ω208-Ω209) as they describe the cyclical nature of the narrative of salvation history, where the language used to describe the prelapsarian state is the same as that used in depictions of Heaven (the line describes a counter-factual but could equally be applied to both prelapsarian earth or Heaven itself); that language is necessarily constructed from the negation of the corporeal world:

> We all suffer for our first father’s guilt,
All his offspring after him have fallen into harm,
Through him death came into this earth and other miseries
Not any man else was dead or sick, nor miserable,
But might live evermore in bliss and health.

The emphasis placed on ‘reste abuten swunche’ [rest without toil] (373/Ω386) links the hereafter with the story of Creation, returning the blessed to the relationship with God that Adam shared.
As I note in p. 218 the Conduct of Life only makes two direct references to the ‘soule’. The first instance, a reference to the narrator in the corporeal world, was discussed in ‘Soul and Body’ (pp. 218–230); the second is important to this discussion as it concerns the body and soul in the post-mortem state of Heaven. This reference is part of the final exhortation that God may bring us to ‘pare blisse’ [that bliss (the heavenly state)] (397/Ω414) ‘[p]ane he ure sowle unbint of lichamliche bende.’ [When he our souls unbinds from the body’s bonds] (398/Ω415). As noted earlier (p.225), Guerric’s evocation of the body as ‘ivory’ refers specifically to the body’s state after resurrection; a state whose achievement may be dependent upon exercising ‘the virtue of continence’ in life. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 formalised the doctrine of the resurrection of the body thus: ‘all rise with their individual bodies, that is, the bodies which they now wear’; the council’s evident anxiety to stipulate what will happen to the bodies of individuals at the Final Judgement so categorically and vociferously suggests how contentious an issue this was. To some writers and theologians, particularly Cistercians such as Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry, there was a ‘profound sense of the person as psychomatic unity and of the earthly body as a means to glory and ecstasy’; for such thinkers the body and soul was a partnership that shares labour in life and therefore, also, rewards in heaven. A contemporary homily which illuminates this narrative is An Bispel, from MS. Vespasian A 22, which states:

and þăn lat me þa sawle to merchestóe. þat his se morʒemet si blisse þe he hað an þar sawle. þat wite ze wel. nan halege nað his fulle blisse er he underfó adomes deıe his licame. þat wrð se fulle mete. þan se mann mid sawle and mid licame underfangð sicernesse of écer blisse.

[and then the soul is led to the festival hall; that is the morning-meat, the bliss that he hath in the soul; for ye know well that no holy man hath his perfect bliss ere he receive again his body at doomsday, that shall be the perfect meat when the man with the soul and body shall receive the assurance of eternal bliss.]

693 Guerric of Igny, Sermon 26, p. 37
695 This point is discussed in detail in Bynum, The Resurrection of the Body, pp. 121ff.
696 Bynum, The Resurrection of the Body, p. 166
697 Morris 1867, p. 239.
This verse foresees a reunification of body and soul in order to achieve heavenly bliss.

By contrast, in the *Conduct of Life* the resurrection of the body is absent from the description of the heavenly state. This is in part due to the telescoping of the post-mortem period within the text: as I have noted, the text does not contain a description of the Last Judgement, rather, it concentrates on the personal judgement that takes place immediately after death, and the need for a quick repentance. As a result, a discussion of the resurrection of the body becomes less important than the didactic message of the sermon as a whole. The wording of the line maintains a polarity between body and soul that is found throughout the verse sermon, which the author of the text would surely have felt muddied by a considered discussion of the reuniting of the two halves of the whole in Heaven. Throughout the *Conduct of Life* the body is considered corrupt and contemptible through its descriptions of transitory life, the visual representation of the failing health of the narrator, and, as we shall see, through the language used in the descriptions of Hell.

Such utilisation of the binaries of body and soul are common to texts that have *contemptus mundi* at their didactic core. Emerson says of the *Vision of Tundale* that:

> Marcus’s hellish images of digestion, decay, decomposition, and partition all disappear in his paradise. In Bynum’s terms, Marcus moves away from biological process, from digestion and decomposition, and moves body into soul.\(^{698}\)

In the *Conduct of Life*, similarly, there is a rejection of the bodily and the corporeal world through the language of negation in its description of Heaven. Emerson continues by noting that the blessed that Tundale encounters in Heaven ‘lack the dangerous senses of taste and touch, that is, those relating to eating and sexuality, or in other words, to need or desire.’ In contrast, however, both the *Vision of Tundale* and the *Conduct of Life* do privilege one sense above all others in their discussion of Heaven: the sense of sight.

In Line 370/Ω383 God is described as ‘soð sunne and briht and dai abute nihte.’\(^{699}\) [true sun and bright, and day without night]. This is a continuation of the narrative that contrasts the corporeal with the celestial and a furtherance of the absence of negatives. Light, which is intrinsically linked with the sense of sight and is, therefore, an extension of the ‘sensitive soul’ (discussed on p.232), takes on a privileged celestial status in the *Conduct of Life*. In comparison, desires and senses that are linked to the body, such as those associated with drinking and eating, are absent from the rewards of heaven: ‘Ne sal þar ben bread ne win, ne oðer kennes este’ [There shall be no bread nor wine, nor other kinds of delights] (363/Ω376). The reasoning given in the *Conduct of Life* is that ‘God one sal ben ache lif and blisse and ache reste’ [God alone shall be eternal life and bliss and eternal rest] (364/Ω377), with Heaven ultimately represented as the spiritual realisation of the relationship of the individual with God. This is achieved specifically through the transcendental power of sight, which with it brings knowledge – an idea which will be explored in the remainder of this section.

The idea of continuous light in Heaven found in the *Conduct of Life* can also be seen in post-Conquest visionary material, such as *St. Brendan’s Voyage* where The Land of Promise of The Saints is described in Edenistic terms and as being without night and with a light that always shone.\(^{700}\) Furthermore, in another account from the period, the *Monk of Evesham’s Vision*, the visionary is led through the various levels of Hell before entering the realms of the blessed where he gives an account of the celestial light, which he describes as a supernatural heightening of his own sense of sight:

\[
\text{hoc enim [non solum] verbis exprimere, sed nec mente sufficio recordari. Splendor ille blandus et coruscus sic intuentem in se rapiebat, sic nitoris immensitate super se}
\]

---

\(^{699}\) The authority upon which the above line is drawn is Isaiah 60: 19-20.

\(^{700}\) Eileen Gardiner (ed.) *Visions of Heaven and Hell Before Dante* (New York, 1989), p. 125. It is never stated that this island is Heaven or represents it. However, the Edenic backdrop, the continuous light, which represents the presence of Christ, and the statement that the island will be returned to at some point in the future but only by the elect, strongly suggest that the audience should believe that it is.
efferebat, ut nihil in ejus comparatione esse crederem, quicquid me contigit eatenus inspexisse; nam splendor ille, quamvis inæstimabilis esset, intuentis tamen non reverberabat, sed potius acuebat obtutum; inferius autem intuenti nihil aliud occurrebat nisi lux et murus, ut dictum est, crystallinus.701

[But how glittering was the inconceivable brightness, or how strong was the light which filled all those places, let no one ask of me, for this I am not able to express in words, nor even to recollect in my mind. That soft and glittering splendour so dazzled my eyes, that I could think of nothing to be compared to it which I had ever seen before; for that brightness, inconceivable as it was, did not blind the eye-sight, but rather sharpened it; and as I looked on it, nothing else met my sight than the light and the wall of crystal before mentioned.]702

The visionary in the above text is at pains to state that what he saw was not actually ‘cælum cælorum’703 [the Heaven of Heavens]. The true Heaven is saved only for those who have genuinely qualified for entrance by their acts in this life, death and individual judgement. The monk of Evesham continues:

In hac tamen visione tantum lætitiae et gaudii, tantum jucunditatis animo conepi et exultationis, ut quicquid humana explicari potest industria minus sit ad expressendum cordis mei gandium, quod ibidem percepi.704

[In this vision, however, I conceived in my mind so much delight and joy, so much happiness and exultation, that whatever can be explained by human ingenuity would fail to express the delight of my heart which I there felt.]705

This instance of the inexpressibility of Heaven and the claim that what is being seen is not actually the true heavenly realm is a common theme in visionary literature. Robert Easting contends that within the corpus of visionary works there is:

a careful insistence about what is not seen or what cannot be recounted, either because the visionary is not permitted to see heaven proper, or because there is a strict obligation placed on visionaries not to speak of such divine mysteries as they are allowed to

703 Rogeri de Wendover, Chronica, sive Flores Historiarum, p. 116.
705 Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History, p. 163.
witness, or because heaven is, strictly speaking, beyond imagination and verbalization.\textsuperscript{706}

As has been discussed earlier (pp. 210-12), there was a certain amount of scepticism about visionary material and accounts of Heaven. Although 2 Corinthians 12: 2–4 is the basis for many such visionary accounts, it comes with the disclaimer that what is seen or heard ‘is not granted to man to utter.’ This generally led to a cautious approach, on the part of the visionary, to descriptions of the heavenly realm. Paul also states in 1 Corinthians 2: 9, drawing from Isaiah 64: 4:

\begin{quote}
\textit{sed sicut scriptum est quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit nec in cor hominum ascendit quae praeparavit Deus his qui diligent illum [But, as it is written: That eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him.]
\end{quote}

There is therefore an inexpressibility topos associated with descriptions of Heaven that is found in the \textit{Conduct of Life} when the narrator says, ‘Ne mai hit nafre no man ðæt seggen mid iwisse | Hwu muchele murihðe habbed þo þe beð in Godes blisse!’ [Nor may any other man ever say it with certainty, | How much mirth those have that are in God’s bliss.]}\textsuperscript{707}

\begin{quote}
Ne mei non heorte þenchen ne nowiht arechen
Ne no muð imelen ne no tunge tegen.
Hu muchel god ðu þierkest wið-inne paradise.
Ham þet swinkeð dei and niht iðine seruise.\textsuperscript{708}
[No heart may think nor aught imagine (reach),
Nor no mouth utter, nor tongue teach,
How much good thou preparest within Paradise,
For them that work day and night in thy service.]
\end{quote}

For the narrator of the \textit{Conduct of Life} the true essence of Heaven is spiritual rather than physical. As well as rejecting the bodily sensations of eating and drinking, the narrator states that there will be no need for clothing or material wealth:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{707}See also \textit{Sinners Beware} (Morris 1873, p. 73): ‘Ne may no tunge telle. | þe blisse þat þer is euere’ [No tongue may tell of the eternal-bliss of heaven] (lines 88–89) and \textit{A prayer to the Virgin} (Morris 1872, 196): ‘And send me in-to þat blisse þat tunge ne mai tellen.’ [And send me into that bliss that no tongue may tell] (line 12).
\textsuperscript{708}Morris 1867, p. 193, lines 47–50.
Ne sal þar ben foh ne grai, ne cunin ne ermine,
Ne aquerne, ne methes chele, ne beuer, ne sableine.
Ne sal þar ben naðer scat ne srud, ne wereldes wele none. (365-367/Ω378-Ω379)
There shall be no spotted nor grey [fur], nor rabbit nor ermine [fur],
Nor squirrel, nor martin, nor beaver, nor sable.
There shall be neither sheet nor shroud, nor any world’s wealth.

For the narrator and his audiences Heaven is more than an improved revision of earthly life; it is the personal relationship and the perfect union that the individual has with God. The Conduct of Life accomplishes this through the sense of sight, ‘the most excellent of the body’s senses’, when he says that, ‘Þar me Drihte self isien swo se is, mid iwisse! | He one mai and sal al ben angles and manne blisse! [There the Lord himself shall be seen as he is, most certainly. | He alone may and shall be the bliss of all the angels and men.] (379-380/Ω392-Ω393).

The most important biblical passage with regard to seeing God is included in Christ’s Sermon upon the Mount (Matthew 5: 8), in which he preaches: ’beati mundo corde quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt’ [Blessed are the clean of heart: for they shall see God]. It is usually believed that this vision of God is to occur post mortem, since, in Exodus 33: 20, God tells Moses, ‘rursumque ait non poteris videre faciem meam’ [And again he said: Thou canst not see my face: for man shall not see me and live]. This, once more, has led those who have written visionary texts to either insert the appellation that what is really being seen is not actually Heaven or to shy away from a description altogether. Easting states that:

For many visionary soul-journeymers following in what Zaleski calls the Drythelm ‘line’, heaven itself is not accessible either because they are not really dead, though they appear to be; or they ‘really’ are dead, but are not yet sufficiently pure to encounter heaven and are therefore sent back to amend their lives, and to warn others to do likewise.709

It follows, therefore, that if Heaven is sight of God, then it is not possible for a visionary to have access to this place and return to a living state. However, there are a number of passages from the

709 Easting, ‘Access to Heaven in Medieval Visions of the Otherworld’, 79
Bible that make this a challenging area of theology. In Genesis 32: 30, Jacob claims to have seen God ‘face to face’ and that his ‘soul has been saved’. Isaiah also claims to have had a vision of God. However, there are New Testament passages that contend that there is no possibility of seeing God even within the heavenly state, including John 1: 18 which states, ‘Deum nemo vidit umquam unigenitus Filius qui est in sinu Patris ipse enarravit’ [No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him].

The distinction between the two kinds of vision, the one possible in this life (in via) and that found in heaven (in patria), and the question of whether the true essence of God could be comprehended in the afterlife led to considerable debate during the medieval period. It may be stated with some confidence that the ascendant view in the post-Conquest period would have been in line with Augustine: a full vision of God is not possible in this life, but would be possible in the next. Hugh of St. Victor states that:

The blessed will see God and all knowledge in a single glance […]. In their vision of God there will be no medium or theophany; God will be known face to face.

Having said this, McGinn contends that the ‘visionary explosion in Western mysticism and … revival of Dionysianism’ also suggest that during this period what was seen of God in Heaven and during this earthly life was by no means settled; McGinn continues by stating that, in the twelfth century, a ‘new wave of visions began that featured frequently repeated raptures to a supernatural
realm and encounters with heavenly figures, often of a direct and transformative and therefore mystical character.\textsuperscript{714} For instance, twelfth-century visionary material often involved descriptions of Heaven by individuals who were then returned to life, which laid claim to a level of insight that previous material had been anxious to avoid. In the \textit{Vision of Tundale}, ‘unusual knowledge was given to Tundale so that he also no longer had to ask about anything anymore, since he knew openly and wholly everything that he desired.’\textsuperscript{715} There is a totality of insight in this passage that is suggestive of the post-mortem happiness of Heaven that becomes central to Thomas Aquinas’ idea of the abode of the blessed a century later.\textsuperscript{716}

Such was the debate about what was possible to see in this life and the next that twelfth century theologians such as Richard of St. Victor felt the need to set out more clearly the different types of vision possible in this life and in Heaven:

There are four kinds of vision: (1) to see with bodily eyes the things of this world; (2) to see mystical meaning contained in visible things (e.g., the burning bush); (3) to see with the eye of the heart likenesses in visible things which lead one to knowledge of invisible things; (4) to contemplate heavenly things without any mediating figures of visible things. The vision of heaven is an instance of the fourth kind.\textsuperscript{717}

The \textit{Conduct of Life}, it would seem, is a text whose representation of Heaven abandons traditional descriptions of Heaven as a celestial city or an edenic paradise in favour of a state in which the souls of the blessed are able to obtain knowledge of everything through the sight of God. Van Os states that this feature is not present in earlier Anglo-Saxon writing, highlighting the regular occurrence of it in later writings.\textsuperscript{718} In the \textit{Conduct of Life}, although all of the blessed will share in the beatific

\textsuperscript{714} McGinn, \textit{Visio Dei}, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{715} Gardiner, \textit{Visions of Heaven and Hell Before Dante}, p. 192.
\textsuperscript{716} For a full discussion of Thomas Aquinas and Beatitude, see Lawrence F. Hundersmarck, ‘Thomas Aquinas on Beatitude,’ in Jan Swango Emerson and Hugh Feiss (eds.), \textit{Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays} (New York, 2000), 165-184.
\textsuperscript{718} Van Os, \textit{Religious Visions}, p. 160.
vision, the level of their inclusion is dependent upon their earthly acts. The narrator of the *Conduct of Life* states:

> And þeih ne bed here eien naht alle iliche brihte,
Hi nabbeð naht iliche muchel alle of Godes lihte;
On þesse liue he naren naht alle of ore mihte,
Ne þar ne sullen habben God alle bi one wihtë.
Po sullen more of him isien þe luueden hine more,
And more icnownen and ec witen his mihte and his ore. (381-386/Ω394-Ω399)

[And yet their eyes shall not be all alike bright,
They have not all equal amount of God's light;
In this life they were not all of one virtue,
Nor shall they there have God all by one measure.
Those shall see more of him who loved him more here,
And know more and also learn of his might and of his mercy.]

What is being created is a multi-layered Heaven. This is not uncommon in descriptions of Heaven that take a topographical form, but in the *Conduct of Life* the Heaven being described is an abandonment of all that is corporeal and the emphasis is on the spiritual actualisation of the physical act of seeing.\(^719\) Through the sense of sight, a multilayered transcendental heaven is revealed. McGinn claims that:

> Precisely why the early Christians placed such emphasis on seeing God may have much to do with their cultural milieu in which the visual was so strongly privileged.\(^720\)

Early theologians such as Clement of Alexandria, McGinn points out, held the belief therefore that the beatific vision of God in Heaven was prepared for in this life by imperfect sight. This returns us to line 18/Ω19 of the *Conduct of Life* where the narrator says, ‘Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste.’ [I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist]. This is a very real, physical condition for the narrator, linked to the sinful state of the soul, but it also emphasises the transition that will be made by the blessed in the achievement of Heaven. The impossibility and failure of the corporeal vision in this world is juxtaposed against the spiritual realities of the sight of God in the

---

\(^719\) In the *Vision of Tundale* there are three enclosures separated by three walls. The central one might be described as Heaven.

\(^720\) McGinn, ‘Visio Dei’, p. 17.
final section of the sermon. In 1 Corinthians 13: 12, Paul says, ‘We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known.’ [Should be in Latin with Translation] The heavenly sight is not just the physical act of looking, it is knowledge and is beyond the earthly. It is therefore only when God ‘oure sowle unbint of lichamliche bende’ [our souls unbinds from the body’s bonds] (398/Ω415) that such ‘blisse’ may be experienced.

**Hell**

In contrast to Heaven, Hell in the *Conduct of Life* is conceptualised as a state visited upon the bodily senses rather than upon the soul: those senses whose obsolescence is in some ways the foundation of the experience of heaven are returned to the soul in hell with redoubled intensity.721 The verse sermon mobilises instantly recognisable images in its representation of Hell. At the beginning of this Introduction, in a discussion of the influence of the *Visio Sancti Pauli* upon later medieval descriptions of Hell, I stated that the *Conduct of Life* drew on a ‘storehouse’ of motifs and used ‘stock themes’ in its descriptions; this final section will discuss how these ‘stock themes’ are arranged around and enacted upon the body of the sinner. In an early study of the *Conduct of Life*, Van Os says of the verse sermon that:

This monitory poem describes the torments of hell, together with the tormented, tormentors, instruments of torment and tormenting conditions in hell. […] The torments are of the traditional kind; so is the list of tormented sinners and the instruments of torment.722

Though the torments of Hell may be of a ‘traditional kind’ the *Conduct of Life* deploys them as part of a recognisable formula that is intended to elicit a reaction from its audiences that will lead them

---

721 Emerson notes something similar in the description of hell found in the *Vision of Tundale* (Emerson, ‘Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses in the Vision of Tundal’, p. 4ff).
722 Van Os, *Religious Visions*, p. 137.
to repentance. Therefore, in the *Conduct of Life*, as in all representations of Hell throughout Christian theology, when the salvation of the soul is at stake,

> **[t]**he worst that can befall man is only the worst that he can imagine in his separate environments. Basically, Hell had to be as terrifying as imagination could make it.\(^{723}\)

Because of the difference in descriptive detailing of the scenes of Heaven and Hell, it is often the case that Hell is more extensively treated than Heaven, and this is true of the *Conduct of Life*. Its reliance on known and very real elements of life, such as pain and suffering, gives the authors of such texts a greater range of, and liberality with, the material from which to work, although – as will be seen – there is always an emphasis on inexpressibility. Heaven is often envisioned as being beyond human comprehension, and any attempt to render it imaginatively is undertaken tentatively, or without explicitly naming it. Hell, however, is a very real actualisation of pains and torments based upon the realities of physical hardship in this life. Heaven is portrayed as an absence of all that is suffered on earth, and those sufferings are magnified in descriptions of Hell. The description of Heaven naturally comes second in the *Conduct of Life*, as it does in other descriptions of the afterlife, as it is reliant on and defined by what it is not. However, for the purposes of this discussion, it seemed prudent to end this introduction with a discussion of how the senses most associated with the body are utilised in the description of Hell found within the *Conduct of Life*.

Possibly the most recognisable of the elements of infernal torture in the *Conduct of Life* is the author’s use of fire. The fire of Hell, in the *Conduct of Life*, is used as a deterrent to those who have not given due consideration to their actions in this life. The use of fire at 152-154/Ω159-Ω161 and 251-253/Ω260-Ω262 is reliant upon the association of a known fear with a torment that goes beyond the earthly: a fire that cannot be ‘quenche’ [quenched] (152/Ω159) and that is ‘hundredfeald

hatere þan be ure’ [a hundredfold hotter than ours is] (251/Ω260). The torment plays on the fear of corporeal punishment and pain, as this is the most effective way of achieving repentance in this world. However, the formula used is one that extends the torment of what is real to a place where the fire can burn in a ‘supernatural’ way: a hundred times hotter than earthly fire, and is unquenchable. Paine says of Hell that although it was often said to be inhabited by what is truly unimaginable, this could not be the case:

...[T]he restrictions of the imagination could not – and still cannot – conceive of anything completely and truly imaginary; everything man conceives is from his personal prison – his earth-mind.\(^{724}\)

Where heaven is constructed around an ‘absence of negatives’, Hell, in the Conduct of Life, takes the most negative elements of what is present within the sections concerned with this transitory life (the contemptus mundi) and multiplies them: these are necessarily enacted upon the body.

Heat is not the only natural element acting upon the bodies of the damned in the Conduct of Life. It is alternated with images of freezing cold in 138/Ω143 and in 236-240/Ω245-Ω249, where it reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle H \rangle & \text{ie fareð fram hate [to] chele, fram chele to hate;} \\
\langle B \rangle & \text{an hie beð in þe hate – chele hem þuncheð blisse,} \\
\langle B \rangle & \text{an hie cumeð eft to chele of hate hie habbed misse!} \\
\langle E \rangle & \text{idør doð \& hem/ wo inoh, nabbed hie none lisse;} \\
\langle N \rangle & \text{iten hweðer hem doð wers to nafre non wisse. (236-240/Ω245-Ω249)}
\end{align*}
\]

[They go from heat to cold, from cold to heat; 
When they are in the heat – cold seems bliss to them, 
When they come again to the cold they miss the heat. 
In both they suffer woe enough, they have no peace; 
They know not with any certainty which is worse.]

Although scriptural authority for the alternation of heat and cold (236/Ω245) is established in Job 24: 19 several studies have suggested that strong motifs of cold and frost were more prominent

\(^{724}\) Paine, The Hierarchy of Hell, p. 11.
within descriptions of Hell in places where the climate itself reflected such a hardship.\textsuperscript{725} It is perhaps, therefore, unsurprising to find such conceptions in the \textit{Conduct of Life}, which was written in a place and at a time where the physical hardship of a harsh winter, and the possible threat of death brought about by the cold, were more realistic fears.

Furthermore, Healey argues for the existence of a tradition in Anglo-Saxon literature - possibly based upon the \textit{Visio Sancti Pauli} – which locates Hell and Heaven on a north-west/south-east axis, citing two passages from \textit{Genesis B} that situate the location of Lucifer in the North and West.\textsuperscript{726} Wright concurs that, \textquote{the location of hell in the north is commonplace\textquote} and suggests that the long versions of the \textit{Visio Sancti Pauli} and several of the redactions suggest a north or north-west direction.\textsuperscript{727} Wright also, in a section that suggests a possible influence of the \textit{Visio Sancti Pauli} upon \textit{Blickling Homily XVI}, notes that the trees in the homily are frosty and not fiery, as they are in the \textit{Visio Sancti Pauli}. He proposes that:

\begin{quote}
the change from fiery to icy trees is a logical corollary of the northern setting of the punishment in the homily, and it is characteristic of hell that fire and ice are coexisting (sometimes alternating) torments.\textsuperscript{728}
\end{quote}

The movement from burning heat to freezing cold in the \textit{Conduct of Life} also has an antecedent in the \textit{Vision of Drythelm} where a great valley is described with destructive flames on the one side and hail mixed with snow on the other. Souls are described as being moved as if by a violent storm from one side to the other: at first to avoid the heat and then to escape the excessive cold. The similarity between this scene and the one in the \textit{Conduct of Life (236-238/\Omega 245-\Omega 247)}

\textsuperscript{725} See, for instance, Van Os, \textit{Religious Visions}, p. 90, where he states that \textquote{the torment of extreme cold had rather a stronger hold upon the imagination of the northern race of Englishmen than upon that of more southerly peoples}.\textsuperscript{725}


\textsuperscript{727} Wright, \textit{The Irish Tradition}, p. 129.

\textsuperscript{728} Wright, \textit{The Irish Tradition}, p. 151.
suggests that the author was aware of this text, or an intermediate text that drew on Bede, for his description of the torments of Hell.\footnote{Hill 1972, p. 120 also draws a comparison between this section from Bede and line 244/Ω253.}

The pairing of heat with cold is also regularly found in contemporary descriptions of hell from this period and would appear to be a recurring motif present in such portrayals. Two similar descriptions of the alternation of heat and cold to those found in the *Conduct of Life* and in the *Vision of Drythem* are also found in *Sawles Warde* and *Vices and Virtues*. In *Sawles Warde*, for example, it is stated:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{þer is remuange ðe brune.} & \quad \text{ant toðes hechelunge ðe snawi weattres. ferliche ha} \\
& \text{flutteð from þe heate} \quad \text{in to þe chele. Ne neaȝer nuten ha of þeos twa} \quad \text{hweðer ham þuncheð wurse. for eiðer is unþolelich. ant ðis ferliche mong þe} \\
& \text{leatere ðurh þe earre derued þe mare.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{[There is shrieking in the flames, and chattering of teeth in the snowy waters. Suddenly they flit from the heat into the cold, nor ever do they know of these two which is worse for them, for each is intolerable. And in this marvellous mingling the latter through the former tormenteth the more].}\footnote{Morris 1867, p. 251.}

Further examples from the period suggest that the pairing of the two elements had become an accepted part of the topography of Hell. For instance, in *Death*, found in both Cotton MS. Caligula A. ix and Jesus, the Soul exclaims that because of the Body’s actions, ‘ich schal bernen in fur. | and chyueren in yse’ \[I shall burn in fire and shiver in ice\].\footnote{Morris 1878, p. 177.} Similarly, in *Sinners Beware*, which follows the *Conduct of Life* in Jesus, cold and heat are once again paired and are followed quickly after by another coupling of torments typical of descriptions of hell, including the *Conduct of Life*: hunger and thirst. *Sinners Beware* reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Her is chele and hete.} \\
\text{And hunger vnmete.} \\
\text{And þurst elles to kene. (49-51)} \\
\text{[There is cold and hete} \\
\text{and immeasurable hunger} \\
\text{and thirst beyond cruel.]} \\
\end{align*}\]
In comparison, the *Conduct of Life* states that punishment by ‘hunger and ñurst euel two iferen’ (233/Ω240) [hunger and thirst, two evils together] will be suffered by those that ‘ware mete niðinges here’ (234/Ω241) [were meat-miserly here]. The use of measure-for-measure punishment – assigning specific torments to a particular group based on the sins that they have committed in this life: perpetual hunger and thirst for those who sinned through gluttony – illustrates the connection between all three realms: on earth (transitory), in heaven (spiritual reward), and in hell (physical punishment). It illustrates how themes (and images) are repeated and reinforced, interlinked and interlaced, throughout the *Conduct of Life*. This facilitates the didactic message of the sermon, which is reliant upon the cyclical nature of Salvation History and the dualistic approach of punishment and reward in the afterlife, through the use of the physical and the use of the spiritual.

In the *Conduct of Life* it is stated that:

\[
\text{Vre foremes faderes gult we abugeð alle,}
\text{Al his ofsprung after him in harem is biualle,}
\text{Þurst and hunger, chele and hete and alle unhalðe. (197-199/Ω204-Ω206)}
\[
\text{[For our first father’s guilt we all suffer,}
\text{All his offspring after him are fallen into harm,}
\text{Thirst and hunger, cold and heat, and all illness.]
\]

The sermon establishes how the earthly suffering of ‘Þurst and hunger’ [thirst and hunger] were brought into the world by Adam’s sin.\(^{732}\) In establishing a period of time when, and a reason why, such hardships came into the world, the narrator alludes to a period before such conditions were present and by doing so helps to describe the afterlife. Thirst and hunger (and heat and cold) are very physical conditions enacted upon the body. Therefore, in Heaven they are absent: ‘þar nis hunger, ne þurst’ (327/Ω338) [there is no hunger or thirst], as the body is absent; whereas, in Hell they are exaggerated and distorted, ‘Swo þat he witen þat here pine sal nafre habben ende!’ (294/Ω305) [As they know that their pain shall never have an end!]. However, it is not the descriptions of the heavenly abode or of hellish punishments that are at the sermon’s didactic core, but the

\(^{732}\) It should be noted that alongside ‘Þurst and hunger’ we find ‘chele and hete’.
individual's actions in this life. Both versions of the afterlife (Heaven and Hell) work in comparison with the living world: it is the gluttony of those who were meat-miserly (234/Ω241) and who had a ‘ful wombe’ [full stomach] and ‘lihtliche speken of hunger and of fasten’ (147/Ω154) [speak lighty of hunger and fasts], that will lead them to the punishments in hell; and it is the protection afforded by ‘almesse’ [alms], fasten [fasting], and ‘ibeden’ [prayers] (339/Ω351) that will lead the sinner to heaven. The sinner is, therefore, didactically returned to his actions in this life.

The lines quoted previously (236–240/Ω245–Ω249), upon the transition between heat and cold, are followed in the sermon by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(H)} & \text{ie walkeð afre and secheð reste, ac hie hes ne muʒen imeten,} \\
\text{(F)} & \text{or þi þe hie nolde, þe hwile hie mihten here, senne beten;} \\
\text{(H)} & \text{ie sec\textbackslash h/eð reste þar non nis, ac hie hies ne muʒen ifinden,} \\
\text{(A)} & \text{c walkeð weri up and dun, se water doð mid winde. (241-244/Ω250-Ω253)}
\end{align*}
\]

[They ever walk and seek rest, but they cannot find it, Because they would not, while they could here, repent of their sins; They seek rest where there is none, and they cannot find it, But walk weary up and down, as water doth (tossed) with the wind.]

Hell is described in terms that suggest not only physical pain and suffering but also constant activity. Hill describes the Hell of the Conduct of Life as depicted in terms that suggest not only physical pain and suffering but also ‘activity’, ‘timeless movement’ and ‘ceaseless wandering’.\textsuperscript{733} Once again the pre-fall state, the transitory world, and the abodes of the afterlife can be compared and contrasted through the repetition and re-appropriation of themes concerning activity and rest (the physical and the spiritual). Initial (worldly) activity was brought about by Adam, who moved humanity out of the earthly paradise and into the transitory world. Heaven is described as a place of ‘reste abuten swunche’ [rest without toil] (373/Ω386) where activity is replaced by knowledge of God (‘reste’) – descriptively achieved through the negation of the earthly ‘swunche’ [toil]; Hell is an exaggerated, frenzied and never-ending exaggeration of the earthly, where ‘reste’ cannot be achieved even though it is always sought. A similar contemporary example of continuous torment

\textsuperscript{733} Hill 1972, p. 120.
without rest is found in *The XI Pains of Hell*, also found in Jesus, where, after a description of the tortures found in Hell, the narrator says of the guilty soul: ‘Naueþ heo neuer reste ne ro’ [it never has rest nor peace].

This whole sequence (236-244/Ω245-Ω253) in the *Conduct of Life*, therefore, communicates the essence of everlasting torment. It contains the *poena sensus*, or the pain of sense, which is usually inflicted upon the body by the torment of fire,\(^{734}\) as it is in the above description where it is alternated with extreme cold, but it also encompasses the *poena damni*, pain of loss, which manifests itself in the eternal search for, and inability to find, ‘reste’. The idea of ‘reste’ represents, as was discussed earlier, not only the cessation of the physical hardship of Hell but also the spiritual fulfilment achieved in Heaven. Therefore, seeking ‘reste þar non nis’ [rest where none is] (243/Ω252) is indicative of ‘the desolation of God’s abandonment, which is eternal.’\(^{735}\) The *poena damni* and the *poena sensus* are considered to be the ‘basic anguish of the damned, with the *poena damni* being the worst’.\(^{736}\)

However, in these lines the idea of God’s abandonment has been made physical. The narrator once again employs a punishment that is linked to the worldly sin, as it is those who were inconsistent in their spiritual life (internally wandering) that are emphasized as receiving no ‘reste’ in hell: the spiritual movement of the individual in life has been turned into a physical act of torture in Hell, as the sinner who now knows what he wants cannot ever achieve it. Similarly, we find further examples in the *Conduct of Life* of specific torments inflicted upon the bodies of the sinner, reserved for the ‘prude’ [proud], ‘niðefule’ [envious] and the ‘evele swiken’ [evil deceivers] who are torn and gnawed upon by ‘naddren and snaken, eveten and fruden’ [adders and snakes, lizards and frogs] (277-278/Ω288-Ω289): their bodies are physically attacked and devoured by the animals of hell. In Emerson’s analysis of the *Vision of Tundal* she highlights that it is the senses of taste and

---


\(^{735}\) Paine, *The Hierarchy of Hell*, p. 31.

touch that are utilized in Tundale’s Hell because they are ‘those senses that need cleansing most’; as the above has demonstrated, the narrator of the Conduct of Life describes Hell in a similar manner.\textsuperscript{737} The sinner in Hell will be deprived of food and drink where in life he had been gluttonous, and will be eaten for all eternity by the beasts that dwell there. Swanson notes of the sinners in hell that ‘their sense of taste and touch are literally turned inside out… [They] do not eat; they are devoured’.\textsuperscript{738}

Hell as a place where the sinner is digested is a common motif in literature, sermons and illuminations contemporary with the Conduct of Life. For example, In Epiphania Domini, also found in Trinity, the sinner makes an exhortation to God asking that the storm does not sink him, ‘ne āt þe deuel me swelge. ne āt þe pit tune ouer me his muð’ [nor the devil swallow me, nor the pit to close its mouth over me].\textsuperscript{739} In addition, the presence of animals that gnaw at the flesh is also commonplace and is found throughout the homiletic literature of the period, with a particularly detailed description found in The XI Pains of Hell:\textsuperscript{740}

\begin{verbatim}
Vvþer þer beoþ olde men.
þat among neddreþ. habbeþ heore den.
Heom heo to-styngeþ vychon.
And freþeþ heore fleys. to þe bon.
And neddreþ suþeþ heore brayn (175-179)
[Further on there are old men
that among the snakes have their home.
The snakes sting them
and gnaw their flesh to the bone
and adders suck their brains].
\end{verbatim}

And when this act of digestion is completed, ‘he beoþ al in on’ [they become whole again], so that the torture can continue for all eternity.

The continuous activity and never-ending torments of hell are also denoted by the sounds of the tormented, with the pairing of ‘woning and wop’ [wailing and weeping] (235/Ω244) of those

\textsuperscript{737} Emerson, ‘Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses’, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{738} Emerson, ‘Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses’, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{739} Morris 1867, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{740} For further examples see also: On the Lord’s Day, p. 42, Sinners Beware (lines 52-54), Death (lines 153-54), Dominica Prima in Quadragesima (Morris, Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises (1867), p. 33), and De Defunctis (Morris 1867, p. 173).
in hell contrasted with the ‘angles songe’ [angels’ song] (355/Ω367) of Heaven. This pairing of the cries of the sinners is a convention that is found in other contemporaneous texts and suggests a ‘stock’ means of representing the sounds of hell that might have been called upon during this period. Ferdinand Holthausen demonstrates this in his notes to Vices and Virtues, a text that has many motifs common to both that text and the Conduct of Life, by showing that the combination of ‘wop and woninge’ found in that text is also found as ‘wóp and wánung’ in Wulfstan (139/3) and ‘Be Dómes Daeʒe’ (201), ‘wop and wonynge’ in ‘Sinners Beware’ (p.74/55), and as ‘waning and wop’ in the ‘Poema Morale’.

All of the sins and punishments considered so far, and the senses connected to them, are associated with the flesh of the corporeal world. As has been demonstrated, these sins and senses can be found in the narrator’s descriptions of the transient world and are either perverted through the tortures of hell or are made absent in the description of Heaven. As has also been seen, the physicality of hell should be read, moreover, as a demonstration of the abandonment of God – the lack of ‘reste’ denoting an absence of salvation and the eternal search for the now unachievable state of Heaven. Biernoff states that ‘in the Middle Ages the flesh signified humanity’s inherence in the material world and alienation from God’; the reliance on the flesh in hell, for the punishment of sinners, demonstrates a continuation of this without end.

The final sense to be considered in this section of the Introduction is sight. I have already noted, in pp. 230-237, the centrality of sight in medieval culture and its privileged status within the Conduct of Life. Sight in this world has the ability to connect (de-fracture) the self and bridge the gap between body and soul; it is an extension of the sensitive soul – a sense by which one may come closer to an understanding of God in this life, but it should also be guarded against (enclosed) as it is

---


742 Biernoff, Sight and Embodiment, p. 67.
a vulnerable point at which sin might enter. Sight is ultimately linked to knowledge and is, therefore, a way of achieving, describing and understanding paradise. Where all of the other senses are heightened or perverted in Hell, the sense of sight is dimmed or withdrawn.

Hell is therefore a place of darkness. It is a place where, ‘Afre þar is euel smech, þiesternesse and eie; | Nis þar nafre oðer liht þan þe sparte leie’ [There is ever evil smoke, darkness and awe; / There is never other light than the gloomy frames] (281-282/Ω292-Ω293). Even the flames are gloomy, a common motif in descriptions of Hell where the ‘fire is black or dark fire, burning without giving light and emitting blinding and smothering smoke.’\(^{743}\) The removal of the sense of sight is also the removal of any sense of consolation or hope. It is necessary at this point to return to the line concerning the narrator from earlier in the sermon, where he states ‘Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste’ [I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist] (18/Ω19). The parallels of blinding by smoke on earth and in hell are important to an understanding of the sermon as a whole, as the degeneration of the body and the physical sense of sight are transferred out of the transitory world and made eternal in hell. The physical blinding of the narrator in life should be juxtaposed against the spiritual redemption of inner sight, brought about by repentance and confession, as a means to spiritual and Heavenly accession; but it should also be read against the eternal damnation of the smothering smoke in hell and the abandonment by God – as sight is linked to knowledge of God through the eye of the heart and the beatific vision. To be blind in hell is to be abandoned: physical sight and physical blinding in life are temporary, but the beatific vision of Heaven and the abandonment of hell are eternal.

It follows that if Hell is a manifestation of the worst extremities that can be suffered by the body in this life, it is also the absence of the extraneous influences that give a sense of time and place and therefore security. The narrator says of Hell that ‘Nafre sunne þar ne sineð ne mone ne storre’

\(^{743}\) Cavendish, Visions of Heaven and Hell, p. 113.
[Never shines there the sun, nor moon nor stars] (279/Ω290). The sun and the stars are also the means of measuring the time on earth. Once again, the absence of them in Hell emphasises the eternity of the damnation to which the souls are subjected. The lack of the celestial bodies in Hell therefore signifies the absence of God, the poena damni, as ‘He is soð sunne and briht and dai abute nihte.’ [He is true sun and bright, and day without night] (370/Ω383). Once more the idea of eternity is expressed through the absence of what constitutes earthly time. If there is no day and if there is no night then it follows that there is no succession of seasons or years.
Conclusion

In conclusion, and to return to the manuscript context and longevity of the *Conduct of Life*, the verse-sermon in Lambeth and Trinity as a tool for moral instruction would have been ideal for a preacher – its lucidity, like that of modern *aide-memoires*, is its chief value when judged in its historical context. In the later manuscripts, McClean and Egerton, the text has been placed alongside other devotional material for the contemplation of a female novice. This movement from public performance to contemplative study may initially seem an unexpected and unlikely development for a text devised for preaching, but if considered in the light of the previous discussion on memory, I hope that it is possible to see how the *Conduct of Life* might achieve both purposes and thus give some idea of the sources of its longevity. In both of the later manuscripts, the *Conduct of Life* contains the same mnemonic features of rhyme and metre, as well as being pictorial in detail – whilst maintaining the coherently organised themes. The inclusion of the *Conduct of Life* in a codex intended for contemplative study could be seen as representing an adoption by a more elite culture, or at least one that is now more inclusive of the vernacular, without any alteration to the fundamentally memorial function of the text itself. For the preacher, his audience and the novice reading the text of the *Conduct of Life*, the aim of remembrance and meditation is the same, and the rhyme, metre and pictorial quality serve the same purpose.

The ultimate aim of the *Conduct of Life* is to bring the listener to a specific realisation and to repentance before it is too late. This is achieved through the assertion and the repetition of phrases that are intended to admonish the audience into choosing the spiritual world over the juxtaposed corporal world. In this regard, the *Conduct of Life* has many similarities with contemporaneous lyrics and homiletic texts that focus on the death of the individual and on the art
of dying well, and which have the salvation of the soul at their didactic core. In addition, the
Conduct of Life is part of a tradition that places an emphasis on the transitory nature of this world
through topoi such as the momento mori and contemptus mundi, which function as pedagogic tools
by which to warn the individual to repent before it is too late.

The focus in the Conduct of Life upon the individual at the time of death, rather than on
the more traditional portrayals of a general judgement, reflects a broader theological movement that
places an increasing emphasis on self-examination and penitential self-awareness. This is most
prominently evidenced by the growth in importance of auricular confession and the accompanying
summas and manuals of instruction. The use of the narrator himself is a didactic means of
reinforcement and schooling. He has many similarities with the visionary, acting as a guide to
heaven and hell, and the figure of the old man from contemporaneous lyrics, who laments his own
life choices and urges repentance before it is too late. However, he is also a means of redemption that
might absolve the sins of the individuals through their own confession.

The result of the choice faced by the individual is the difference between an eternity of
spiritual heaven and a very physical hell – where the benefits of an uninhibited, indulgent life on
earth are juxtaposed with the negative physical ramifications of such a choice. The physicality of
hell as opposed to the spirituality of heaven is used to highlight the transience of this life. The poet
himself says that the audience should always be aware of ‘Hwu little hwile we bieð her, hwu longe
elles hware,’ [How little while we are here, how long elsewhere] (331Ω342). Heaven and Hell are
depicted as opposing polarities; if Hell is the extreme of all that is negative in life, then Heaven is the
opposite – a negation of any kind of suffering. Hell is firmly based on the corporeal and Heaven the
spiritual.

The inclusion of the narrator grounds the text and gives a focus to what is being preached.
He is a physical embodiment of what is at stake. His body is the representation of the transience of
life and is therefore synonymous with the choices that are to be made. Upon his form the audience
can see their own debate between soul and body played out. However, the *Conduct of Life* focuses on the sense of sight as a means to de-fracture the divided self. Associations are drawn between the degeneration of the narrator’s sight and the transience of this world and the sin that may lead the individual to damnation. However it is the redemptive quality of repentance that will ultimately reverse the diminishing vision of the narrator, ultimately granting him a redefined idea of what ‘sight’ is through the beatific vision.
Introduction

Discussing his own edition of the Middle English Prose *Brut* for EETS, John J. Thompson recently reflected on the question of why an editor would choose to produce an edition of a text that had been edited before, noting that:

one must always consider seriously whether the editorial effort required is worth it, or whether the long and arduous hours of preliminary research necessary to achieve a new edition might not more profitably be spent on some other kind of textual and codicological study.\(^\text{744}\)

This is a sentiment with which it can sometimes be tempting to agree. In their introduction to the collection in which Thompson’s warning appeared, Gillespie and Hudson write, in an excursus on lexicography, that ‘[many critics] have regarded the editor’s activity as similarly without value to any save himself’. The persistent suspicion of editors, they continue, as scholars consumed by their own self-indulgence and given to producing work of no original value, has led to the circulation of ‘dark rumours’ that ‘certain faculties at certain universities will not accept an edition as a suitable fulfilment of the requirement for a doctorate’.\(^\text{745}\)

Melodramatic as these reflections are, they do raise questions that any editor producing a new edition of a medieval text is bound to consider. Why do we need new editions of old texts? What is the purpose of this ‘new’ edition? How does an editor (this editor) make the decisions that he does concerning methodology, selection of variants and apparatus? And how are these decisions justified and evidenced? As Thompson says, any edition’s methodology and purpose must be declared ‘clearly and unambiguously’ in its introduction, and I will endeavour here to do just that.\(^\text{746}\)


\(^{746}\text{John J. Thompson, ‘Why Edit the Middle English Prose Brut? What’s (Still) in It for Us?’, p. 445.}\)
The *Conduct of Life* has been edited before as extracts, as complete individual texts, as conflated texts, as a composite text (based on the then known six versions of the verse sermon), as texts in parallel, and as a searchable electronic resource.\(^{747}\) Why, then, is another edition of the *Conduct of Life* necessary, or even desirable? Gillespie and Hudson defend the honour of editing as an academic task as such:

> the critic can, if the evidence is too elusive, confused, or incomprehensible, redirect his track to circumvent the problem, [but] there is no escape from the demand to make the edited text comprehensible and transparent – the text sets the problem which cannot be avoided.\(^ {748}\)

This is not a reason in and of itself to produce a new scholarly edition of a work that has already been edited before - to claim that it is might be to risk self-indulgence - but as studies into early-Middle English textual relationships and manuscript studies advance, so must the editions that support such critical thinking. In creating a new edition of the *Conduct of Life* I have had to consider my own approach to the question of what a text is, how textuality can be represented, and what media or apparatuses might represent that most clearly and completely. Concentrating first on the theoretical co-ordinates and methodological choices of my own edition, I will then gesture towards some of the ways in which I believe that the text’s full complexity and significance is no longer fully served by previous editions.

The Lachmannian stemmatic approach to the editing of Middle English, almost exclusively employed during the nineteenth and much of the twentieth century, relies on the evidence of non-authorial errors in surviving witnesses to establish the archetype, or, if the archetype cannot be established, the closest or most representative witness to the now lost archetype. The principle being that these non-authorial errors can demonstrate a relationship between two or more witnesses based on the errors of a scribe or from damage caused to the manuscript, from which a *stemma* or family

---

\(^{747}\) For a full list see, pp. 1-3.

tree can be determined; witnesses, therefore, that demonstrate exclusive descent from another
manuscript within that structure can be eliminated. This approach to the editing of Middle
English reflects the techniques traditionally employed by the editor of classical works, where the
editor attempts to 'reverse the process of transmission and restore the words of the ancients as closely
as possible to their original form'.

Whether this process itself furnishes the best method of finding a text which approximates
most closely to an assumed authorial intention may be another matter: Rosamund Allen, for
instance, has demonstrated that the establishment of familial groups through ‘inaccurate readings’ in
stemmatics means that ‘a rogue late, unrelated, manuscript deriving from a lost ancient but accurate
copy will not be highlighted’. Beyond methodological issues, the recensionist assumption of an
original, singular authorial text, which can be distinguished from scribal texts, is in itself somewhat
problematic, not least in its implicit assumption that authorial and scribal roles are fully
distinguishable. As Paul Meahan points out, ‘critics have become sceptical about the ability to
discern authorial intent and to access an idealised precise text’. However, the need to isolate some
shadow of single authorial intention remains something of a necessity in fixing a text’s singular
existence, however qualified the search is; many editors and critics alike are still, in Allen’s words, ‘
left with the uneasy feeling that we ought to be searching for a set of readings which at least
approximates to what the author wrote’. Similarly, Nicolas Jacobs believes that ‘the original

---

version of a literary work acquires a de facto authority by the mere fact of the author's having
troubled to compose it'.

Though it now appears to be well established that 'the recension […] is a conclusion
resulting from scholarly judgement or conjecture' and cannot be achieved, editors such as Jacobs
believe that 'if it is possible to assert with some plausibility what the reading from which the
variants derive is likely to have been, it is an abdication of editorial judgement to refrain from
suggesting it'. He concludes by stating that 'the possibility of being wrong is the inevitable price of
saying anything of more than trivial interest or significance'.

Whilst acknowledging that an approach that seeks to establish an authoritative text based
upon the intentions of the author is 'arguably appropriate' for some medieval vernacular works,
such as Chaucer, Millett demonstrates, through three separate case studies of early Middle English
textual transmission, that 'other medieval vernacular works suggest less concern for the textual
integrity of the original work, and a less clearly-marked distinction between the functions of author
and scribe'. The stemmatic recensionist approach to editing as the 'science of discovering error in
texts and the art of removing it', as Housman once described it, accepts a modern conception of
ownership and authorship for the text that privileges the original as authority and does not take
into consideration the fluidity of the early Middle English manuscript tradition. As Wogan-
Browne, Watson, Taylor and Evans show in their introduction to a more recent anthology of
literary theory concerning writings in the vernacular:

Our own categories and models for authorship do not often overlap with what can be
deduced from Middle English terminology and practice. The relatively rare word
writere in Middle English is as likely to indicate the scribe as the composer of a literary
work; the term poet is not in widespread use before the fourteenth century; and the

---

754 Nicolas Jacobs, 'Kindly light or foxfire? The authorial text reconsidered', in V. P. McCarren and D. Moffat (eds.) A
756 Bella Millett, 'What is Mouvance?' in Wessex Parallel Web Texts (Southampton, 2003),
757 A. E. Housman, 'The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism', The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman: Volume III:
term for composers and compilers of narrative verse, *maker*, has not survived in any specifically literary sense.\textsuperscript{758}

Here, Wogan-Browne et al present an understanding of the process of composition and production of manuscripts in Middle English that challenges the philosophy that privileges the authority of authorship, reflected in many of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century approaches to textual scholarship and editorial theory - which can be accounted for by modern ideas of the author but cannot be transferred to the Middle English period. Similarly, Matthew Fisher sees this approach to scholarship and editing as being derived from ‘a definition of medieval authorship that axiomatically excludes scribes’ by silently assigning them a ‘fixed and stable intention’: to create an accurate, truthful or faithful copy.\textsuperscript{759} As Fisher contends, the ‘scribal intentionality is excluded by the very vocabulary of textual scholarship and editing’ which requires it to speak to the intentions of the author and, therefore, the constructed idea of an authoritative text ‘framed within a reductive binary of error and accuracy’.\textsuperscript{760}

These developments in how a growing number of textual scholars and editors now approach the manuscript witnesses of Middle English texts have been heavily influenced by the earlier scholarship of both Zumthor and Cerquiglini. Zumthor uses the term *mouvance* to describe textual mobility (variance) in anonymous medieval French poems. His scholarship demonstrates that, in late-medieval texts of French poets where the author was named, the manuscript witnesses were relatively fixed (‘accurate’ scribal copies were produced); but in the more common anonymous poems, where the author was not known, textual variation was much more likely.\textsuperscript{761} These differences between witnesses ranged from changes to the wording.

\textsuperscript{758} Nicholas Watson, Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, Andrew Taylor and Ruth Evans (eds.), *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520* (Exeter, 1999), p. 4.
\textsuperscript{759} Matthew Fisher, ‘When variants aren’t: authors as scribes in some English manuscripts’, in V. Gillespie and A. Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth*, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{760} Fisher, ‘When Variants aren’t’, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{761} Paul Zumthor, *Toward a Medieval Poetics*, translated by P. Bennett (Minneapolis, 1992) pp. 40-76 (p. 47).
or the dialect of the text to more substantial rewritings and rearrangements of whole sections of text.

Zumthor, therefore, argues that an editorial approach that attempts to reconstruct the author’s original as the only authentic version of the text is anachronistic, since early Medieval texts written in the vernacular were ‘not normally regarded as the intellectual property of a single, named author, and might be indefinitely reworked by others’. These re-workings represent different ‘textual states’ that reflect ‘the essential mobility of the medieval text’. Consequently, Zumthor suggests that modern scholarship needs to redefine the concept of a medieval ‘work’ (oeuvre) so that it is no longer ‘identified with the archetype in the traditional editorial diagram of relationships, the stemma’, but reflects ‘the complex unity constituted by the collectivity of its material versions’.

Zumthor’s study of medieval French poetics emphasises mouvance as a product of the ‘continuing interaction between written and oral culture at each stage of transmission’. Zumthor believes that some texts were more likely to introduce variability than others based on both their orality and anonymity. Stephen Morris describes these works that are ‘more readily subject to the linguistic fluidity to which [Zumthor] refers’ as ‘utilitarian texts’, and places sermons within this category. Such fluidity appears to be borne out by the present study of an early Middle English verse sermon with multiple adapted witnesses and strong evidence of an oral tradition behind its production, performance and transmission.

Subsequent scholarship, particularly that of Cerquiglini, builds on this work and demonstrates that such fluidity is not wholly restricted to the ‘intervocal’ transformations
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(mouvance), confirmed by Zumthor’s work, but can be more broadly established in the variance of ‘intertextual’ transmissions within the medieval manuscript tradition. Cerquiglini establishes that the formulation of modernity’s conception of what constitutes a ‘text’, or at least ‘the notion of a reliable text’, is ‘interdependent with the printing industry’s reaching a state that finally provides satisfaction’; the printing press fixed ‘the desire of the author [...] within the two-dimensional limits of the page’, where it could be reproduced ‘in its integrity’.

This is solidified, he argues, at the beginning of the nineteenth century when ‘the idea of literary property acquired the force of law’ and ‘every text was first of all something belonging to the person who conceived it: origins and paternity’. During the nineteenth century, philologists set themselves on a positivist course and saw the need to establish editing as a ‘scientific’ pursuit that would ‘provide itself, through a process of reduction, with an object that was stable, simple, regular, and homogenous’. This was achieved initially through the Lachmannian assumption that copyists ‘were only guilty of mistakes’ and that ‘these errors represented degradation’ and could be eliminated through recensio.

However, as Cerquiglini argues, ‘the author is not a medieval concept’ and the variability of the literary work in the Middle Ages demonstrates that ‘meaning was to be found everywhere, and its origin was nowhere’: the continual rewriting of a work was probably more important than ‘the fact that one hand was the first’. Machan agrees that ‘manuscript copies proliferated diversely, and individual copies underwent alteration without the stabilizing and provident influence of a modern editor’, and similarly finds that the advent of print was essential to the standardization of the authorial text as one that is
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authoritative. This was, Machan contends, in conjunction with a humanist framework that affirms the ‘lexical’ and the ‘idealist’ – ‘lexical in the sense that words are privileged over their material manifestation and idealist in the sense that the essential intended work has priority over a text that might have appeared at a specific moment in a specific document’. Machan argues that for those responsible for transmitting Middle English it was more important to convey the underlying ideas of a work (res) rather than accurately copying the words and rhyme (verba). Whilst a fluidity in precise verbal form appears to be well accepted in current scholarly thinking about the transmission of Middle English, Daniel Wakelin argues, whilst acknowledging the importance of Machan’s work, that rather than having no ‘expectation of the possibility of textual correctness or incorrectness’, as Machan asserts, Middle English scribes would regularly correct texts. Wakelin makes the point that whilst Machan has demonstrated that ‘users of Middle English were sometimes more interested in the contents of a text (res), such corrections remind us that at other times they were interested in its wording (verba).

Whether Middle English scribes were only interested in the text’s content and overall message in their re-workings or whether they also on occasions ‘acted more like editors’ – sometimes ‘correcting’ a text and other times ‘thinking precisely about not varying wording’ – as Wakelin asserts, the evidence suggests that both are true in different contexts. It is important to conclude that an editorial policy that privileges an idea of the original as authority and ignores the multiplicity of meaning within the manuscript culture of the period is wholly anachronistic and flawed. As Stephen G. Nichols states:
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It [philology] joined forces with the mechanical press in a movement away from the multiplicity and variance of a manuscript culture, thereby rejecting, at the same time, the representation of the past which went along with medieval manuscript culture: adaptation or *translatio*, the continual rewriting of past works in a variety of versions, a practice which made even the copying of medieval works an adventure in supplementation rather than faithful imitation.\(^777\)

With this in mind, Gillespie and Hudson conclude in their introduction that ‘there seems to be a consensus that the Lachmannian stemmatic approach to editing should be abandoned as an unattainable ideal’, and then proceed to ask the most important of questions: ‘what should be put in its place?\(^778\)

This is not a new question, of course, and it is one that any editor of a Middle English *work*, such as the *Conduct of Life* – with multiple witnesses - must grapple with. The present edition of the *Conduct of Life* presents the verse-sermon in three different ways. First, it provides the reader with a diplomatic edition of each manuscript witness to the *work*. These diplomatic editions take a non-interventionist editorial strategy in their presentation and should be read in conjunction with the full manuscript descriptions presented within the introduction. This edition’s examination of the codicological differences between the manuscripts of the *Conduct of Life* demonstrates how each new copying of the text appropriates new ‘spaces’ for reception and audience. The physical make-up of the manuscripts which contain the verse sermon indicates how the text has been recontextualized by its contexts and circumstances, with each version of the *Conduct of Life* occupying a different physical space. As Andrew Taylor reminds us, ‘medieval texts need to be read with a full sense of their “situatedness”, the medieval books in which they survive – each of them different and each of them differently interesting – must be given proper attention’.\(^779\) Similarly, Meahan urges editors of medieval texts to ‘recognise their texts as rhetorical pieces designed to represent a specific moment in medieval culture’, arguing that ‘the idea of independent, separately titled texts in any codex

manuscript is not a product of Old or Middle English literature, but rather a post-Romantic idea imported by the reader.\textsuperscript{780}

Douglas Moffat and Vincent P. McCarren claim that ‘only a purely transcriptional or diplomatic edition of a single manuscript might not appear at least to gesture toward an original composition lying somewhere behind the surviving copy’.\textsuperscript{781} Therefore, the \textit{Conduct of Life} should be viewed as having been created as a series of individual texts, which might be individually analysed, because each is different, particularly within its specific physical and historical moment. As has been established, to consider the \textit{Conduct of Life} as a single \textit{work} is anachronistic; however, whilst Moffat and McCarren are surely correct, a diplomatic edition can only give what Millett calls a series of ‘snapshots freezing a single point of textual development’.\textsuperscript{782} Whilst the \textit{Conduct of Life} exists individually as a ‘witness’ recorded in a manuscript, with all of the relations and interactions present within that codex, it also ‘exists outside and hierarchically above its textual manifestations’.\textsuperscript{783} A redefined idea of a ‘work’ (\textit{oeuvre}) is not one that ignores the processes that brought the individual ‘witness’ into being; it is one that engages with the fluidity and collectivity of those witnesses through the variants present within the different manuscript versions. The \textit{work} is, therefore, without fixed shape and is made unstable through its transmission.

For this reason, to offer a scholarly reader only the diplomatic editions of the \textit{Conduct of Life} would be to ignore much of what makes it a ‘work’. The present edition therefore presents the \textit{Conduct of Life} in two further ways that provide the reader with the variants as found in the diplomatic editions, but in formats that more clearly display the similarities and differences between the witnesses: a Parallel Text Edition and a Critical Edition. A comparison of both of these approaches, including the advantages and disadvantages of each, will be discussed now.
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The Critical Edition uses the witness present in the Trinity manuscript as a representative of the textual tradition for the *Conduct of Life*. Trinity is the earliest known version of the *Conduct of Life*; however, the decision to use it as the representative witness is not based not on its age but on the fullness of the witness and the relative consistency of both the ordering of the lines and the syntax found within those lines, in comparison with the remaining witnesses. Ralph Hanna states that ‘all medieval editing generally responds to W. W. Greg’s theory of “copy-text”’; that some single witness is allowed to provide the ongoing local forms of the text, its ‘accidentals’ - by which Hanna broadly means spelling forms and dialect. For Greg, the accidentals within the copy text should, as Hanna phrases it, ‘reflect authorial dialect at least generally’. From this point of departure for the editor the accidentals are accepted, with the value of the substantives free to be tested. Hanna states more than once that ‘the copy-text never should determine the edited textual substantives, but simply provide a convenient form through which to present these’. However, the present edition does not find agreement with this statement: whilst each of the substantives has been closely examined, I have, once again, decided on a non-interventionist approach and do not deviate from Trinity, even if what might be considered a ‘better reading’ is found in another manuscript version. However, I have emended T when the sense seems to me to require it, or when I believe that the understanding of the reader will be facilitated by it.

My work here bears many similarities to d’Avray’s study of French marriage sermons and Bella Millett’s EETS edition of *Ancrene Wisse* – both of which choose a single witness and edit it in the light of the tradition as a whole, correcting where necessary, and recording significant textual
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variations and revisions in other MSS in the *apparatus criticus*.\textsuperscript{789} D’Avray states of his choice of text that it is ‘not a “best manuscript”, though it would be perverse not to choose a good one’.\textsuperscript{790} Similarly, Millett says of her choice of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402 as her ‘base text’ that it is ‘a relatively correct text incorporating some interesting revisions’, providing a ‘vantage-point’ from which to survey earlier and later developments in the work.\textsuperscript{791} In the same way, the present edition’s decision to use Trinity is not because I believe that it is the ‘best text’ or the closest to the original but is because I believe that from it the reader might more easily gain a perspective from which to view the other witnesses and the tradition as a whole.

By choosing Trinity as ‘copy text’ I have reduced the amount of editorial interventions within the edited text and also those which are presented as variants within the *apparatus criticus*. I am aware that by choosing Trinity as my ‘copy text’ I am privileging, for this edition only, the readings found within this text over all of the other manuscript readings. Furthermore, I acknowledge here that to fully reconstruct the remaining texts from the variants in the *apparatus criticus* would be impossible: the necessary constraints of the *apparatus criticus* create an unavoidable tension for both editor and reader. It is the convention of EETS editions, for example, that manuscripts that agree with the lemma are not cited, but this might not always be completely informative. The absence of a sigla may not always mean complete agreement: as Susan Powell acknowledges, ‘a manuscript may have a lacuna at this point or may be imperfect: this may not be evident, since the entry which indicates the manuscript’s absence at this point may be placed several places earlier’.\textsuperscript{792}

In a critical edition the editor is only recording substantive variation in the *apparatus criticus*, and not the accidentals. Tanselle argues that ‘[the] explicit recognition that the comparison
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of readings, leading to inferences about the relationships of the texts, must involve analysis of physical evidence as well as literary analysis: examination of the physical features of a document is relevant not only to dating the document but also to evaluating the readings in the text contained in that document’.  

Further, he argues, in addition to the variations in substantive reading between witnesses, the ‘physical evidence’ and ‘historical background’ can also serve ‘in the tentative establishment of the relationships among the texts’. A part of establishing this ‘physical evidence’ is a closer consideration of the accidentals. Tanselle states that he is ‘not suggesting that scribal punctuation, abbreviations, and spelling necessarily ought to be preserved in a critical text’, but that ‘they should certainly be taken seriously as part of the textual evidence present in manuscripts; they may point to how the text was understood at a particular time’. Similarly, I have concluded that to include all of the variations - including accidentals - of the Conduct of Life within the apparatus criticus of this edition would be almost impossible: the complexity and size of the apparatus would make it inaccessible to the reader, and yet to ignore them completely would be an intellectual abdication.

All of these accidentals can be found in the diplomatic editions of the individual texts which retain the letterforms, capitalisation, punctuation, word-divisions and dialectal features of each manuscript witness, but, as stated previously, what is missing from an analysis of these individual witnesses is a means of showing the relationships between the variants that are present within these witnesses: the substantive ones can be discovered in the apparatus criticus of a critical edition, but this is not possible for all of the accidentals. If the primary interest of the study lies in limning the relationships between the witnesses, and not in an ambition to reconstruct an archetype or to produce a new version of an old text, then reproducing the witnesses in parallel is an opportunity

that provides the researcher with a wealth of information that is not present in a critical edition, and
can only be accessed with difficulty in a comparative study of diplomatic editions.

Significant attention has been given throughout this study to the linguistic and dialectal
differences between the manuscript witnesses. As I hope the discussion of the Editorial Policy and
Guiding Principles associated with this study demonstrates, this reflects the fluid and non-
hierarchical nature of the Middle English textual tradition. This scribal fluidity is particularly clear
in the dialectal variation found in all of the witnesses to the *Conduct of Life*.

Wogan-Browne *et al* state that the ‘unstable and highly localized’ dialects of English ‘often
had to be translated from one dialect to another’, concluding that ‘the vernacular came to stand for
fluidity and instability, as against the stability of Latin’. Similarly, Blake agrees that ‘the absence
of a standard [in English] meant that scribes were usually more than just copyists’, with texts being ‘
rewritten to make them more suitable for other dialects or for later stages of the language’ – both
observations that are given clear demonstration in the *Conduct of Life*. Blake sees in this fluidity
of dialect an increased importance in establishing an idea of original dialect – once more anchoring
the text to its beginnings – while Fisher is more concerned with how ‘variants can record the labour
of a medieval scribe’ and how such dialectal transformations by scribes ‘leave evidence in different
ways than do other scribal alterations, whether textual or visual’.

As I hope has been demonstrated throughout this discussion, my own views have more in
common with those of Fisher, and I seek to emphasise in this edition, to use Wakelin’s terms, ‘how
scribes altered the dialectal colouring of things they copied’. By arranging the texts of the
*Conduct of Life* in parallel it is possible to see more easily the distinctiveness of each witness. As
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Marie Stansfield states in a discussion of her own policy in editing the *Brut*, the parallel-text format ‘provided a strong visual prompt where there were variations to consider and also allowed for an easy word-by-word comparison wherever this appeared appropriate’. As Stansfield concludes, the parallel-text format is ‘very effective in illustrating less obvious differences […] as well as the more striking differences in content’ and is, therefore, very ‘helpful for any close analysis of linguistic or dialectal variation between texts’.

However, one of the main criticisms of the parallel-text edition, as Moffat and McCarren conclude, is the ‘awkwardness of presentation’. A further criticism that is commonly levelled at this type of edition, and is presented here by Powell, is that, ‘in collations the evidence is buried deep and requires a determined pickaxe to dig out’. Both of these criticisms have some validity, but they are also associated with the misguided idea that editors of both parallel and diplomatic editions are not actually editing. Powell concludes that ‘it is not enough to provide collations and then sit back’; this edition is, I hope, an attempt to rise to the implicit challenge of this argument.

This edition of the *Conduct of Life* presents each witness in three formats, either in full or as variants forming a part of the critical apparatus. The reader is encouraged to undertake an holistic approach to this study and use the different presentations interactively: the parallel-text edition and the critical edition are keyed to each other using the sigla ‘Ω’ for ease of reference. Each of the different editions is supported by critical notes that cover language, dialect, scribal practice, manuscript features, variance, themes and sources – appended to the edition that best creates the
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space for their demonstration – as well as being supported by introductory essays that consolidate and contextualise these findings. Stansfield states that ‘problems would arise in attempting to present in printed form more than two witnesses in a parallel-text format’; and they do: reading the Conduct of Life linearly from start to finish would be a somewhat challenging task, but when read in combination with the other editions of the work it becomes a powerful scholarly tool of evidence for mouvance and variance.

In her essay ‘The Architecture of Old English Editions’, Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe states that ‘the walls of an edition […] are both limits and interfaces’ that ‘shape space and, in creating insides and outsides, shape communities of use’. O’Keeffe examines how the ‘structures of editions’, the internal and external walls, ‘construct readers as relatively passive or active’; she determines that the ‘mode’ of reading editions is one of ‘radial reading’; it is ‘non-linear, in that it requires abstraction from the text at hand, is start and stop, and involves consultation outside the text’. It is the ‘architecture’ of the edition that gives directions to the user for their radial reading of the text.

One might ask why, considering the potential for hyperlinking data sets through digital media, variance in the Conduct of Life was not shown through some kind of simultaneous conglomerate electronic edition? O’Keeffe considers that the digital humanities bear the potential for a ‘reimagination of the relationship between editor and reader’; electronic editions have the potential to position readers ‘within the walls of the edition where radial reading in every direction is expected and enabled’. Such potential is also recognised by Stansfield, who concludes that in instances where there are more than two witnesses, digital editions’ usefulness might be proved in
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allowing readers ‘to select different pairs or small groups of versions to view together for textual or dialectal comparison’.\textsuperscript{812}

There are a number of reasons why I elected not to produce an electronic edition, whilst also acknowledging that an interactive electronic scholarly edition of the \textit{Conduct of Life} would be a worthwhile future project. Both Cerquiglini and McGann argue that the flexibility that electronic editions provide, through hypermedia and advanced innovative presentation, may see the book superseded by the computer for scholarly editions.\textsuperscript{813} McGann argues for what he calls ‘the decentred text’, where the single authoritative text, imposed upon the scholarly community by the physicality of the book, is replaced by a platform, or multiple platforms, where authority can be ‘dispersed non-hierarchically across multiple forms of the work’.\textsuperscript{814} However, Millett demonstrates through an assessment of a number of electronic projects that ‘problems with technology and impact constitute particularly serious threats to its [the electronic edition’s] sustainability’.\textsuperscript{815} More recently, Gillespie and Hudson have identified an inherent danger in ‘the relative instability and even impermanence of the electronic medium: the rapid sophistication of computer equipment makes the eventual irretrievability of entered material a real, and damagingly immediate, likelihood’.\textsuperscript{816}

If the longevity of electronic editions has been called into question, individuals’ and institutions’ ability to secure the funding with which to maintain and produce them remains a serious challenge – especially for editions with a relatively small community of end-users. Three reports published by JISC between 2008 and 2011 suggested that academics should adopt a more ‘entrepreneurial’ mindset when it came to the sustainability of web-based digital projects: Millett’s somewhat tongue-in-cheek reaction points out that:

\textsuperscript{812} Stansfield, ‘Parallel texts and a peculiar \textit{Brut}’, p. ????
\textsuperscript{813} A summary of their theories can be found in ‘Whatever happened to Electronic Editing? Bella Millet’tp.41ff or found in more detail in McCann ‘The Rationale of Hypertext’ and Cerquiliin…
\textsuperscript{815} Millett, ‘Whatever happened to electronic editing?’, p. 46.
it is hard to see how even the most efficient market research and project management could convert (say) a seven-manuscript hypertext edition of the *Poema Morale* into the new Facebook, and the attempt would arguably be misconceived; editions of this kind are essentially – as Eric Dobson said of the EETS series of diplomatic editions of *Ancrene Wisse* – *in usum editorum philologorumque*, valuable primarily as a foundation for further research.  

My study of the *Conduct of Life* has been set down on paper for a radial reader who can, if they want, cross-reference from text to text and from the text to the introduction; they can also consider the manuscript witness in each historical moment, or compare variants and consider the fluidity of the work as it moves through the tradition. Alternatively, the reader may accept my own interpretation of the text of Trinity in the critical edition, and consider the content of a verse sermon that continues to be overlooked by scholars despite its longevity and multiple manuscript witnesses.

---

The Format of this Edition: T as Copy Text

This edition takes T as its copy text. T is the most complete text of the *Conduct of Life*, preserving readings that are found in no other witness; it is also the closest to the original in date. All abbreviations and contractions have been silently expanded in accordance with the scribe’s practice where the same or similar words have been written out in full. Tironian ‘et’ has been printed as *and*, where the diplomatic editions retain the occasions where the *nota* is used. The letter form ĺ has been written as w, including in the apparatus. This edition does not differentiate between yogh (ʒ) and insular G (Ɽ): in all instances yogh is used (these differences are represented in the diplomatic editions for all texts) Manuscript i/j and u/v are retained, as well as þ (thorn), ð (eth) and the rare instances of æ (ash).

Word division has been regularized, and punctuation and capitals introduced according to modern usage. Accent marks and manuscript punctuation are not reported, but can be found with the manuscript word division and capitalization in the diplomatic editions. Illumination is not presented but might be reflected in capitalization. Scribal emendation/self correction of T is accepted and noted in the remarks to this edition. Further elucidation of any scribal emendation/self correction for T and for all other texts can be found in the diplomatic editions. Later glosses and additions to the manuscripts are not reproduced here but are found in the diplomatic editions to the text.

This edition reproduces the spelling of the text of T, rare or unique spellings, inflections and syntax being retained wherever there appears to be any justification for them; interlineations in T are shown within the text (through the use of \^\) but are not regularly referenced in the notes, unless additional commentary is needed: further elucidation can also be
found within the diplomatic edition for each text. The emendations made to this text by me are conservative and are only made when the evidence to suggest an alternative reading is overwhelming, or when the manuscript witness is judged to be defective. However, I have not hesitated to amend T in these instances when the sense seems to me to require it or when I believe that the understanding of the reader will be facilitated by it.

Where T has been emended then [] are used to demonstrate this in the text with a note present in the apparatus, for example: 14 mu[c]hel] muhel (scribal error?). The exception to the use of [] for emendations is the 1st person sg. pron., which has been expanded silently to Ich, although such occurrences of expansion are given in the notes; these examples are almost exclusively where it is cliticized with the following word, for example:

Text: Ich dude

Apparatus: Ich dude] idude

Such instances as the above for the other MS versions are not specifically highlighted in the notes to this edition, but the original word-division for each text can be found in the diplomatic editions.

Dialectal difference is not noted in this edition and can be seen more clearly in the parallel texts. The apparatus contains all substantive variants (those which have a separate entry in the OED or MED). A good example here is the use of se in T or in any other variant, usually D, for demonstratives or relatives; in these instances it has not been judged to be a different reading from the more modern þe, þo etc. and, therefore, is not noted in the apparatus. The form of the variant is that of the first manuscript cited and implies nothing about the exact forms in the manuscripts indicated by subsequent sigla, for example: 2 wealde] ealdi DM (where it is eldi in M). The order of manuscripts is given TLDE\textsuperscript{2}E\textsuperscript{1}JM. The variant, when given, is that
found in the manuscript and not an emended version as might be discussed in the diplomatic edition to this text. As T is the copy text it has not been necessary to give the sigla for T after the *lemma* when an emendation has been made by myself to the original manuscript reading or when a more general note on T is necessary, for example 263 wreche men] wrechemen prec. a letter exp., unless the omission of the sigla might lead to some confusion, for example 333 [we]] *om. TDM, or 357 last* *noun in E²E¹M where it is an adv in TDJM*

I have made every attempt to keep clauses and related parts of speech together in the notes to this addition, for example: 1 a lore] ec a lore D, ek on lore J, of lore M, where it might also have been written: 1 and] *add ec DJ a²* on J, of M; this seems logical to me but does, however, constitute an editorial choice in how variants are represented.

In addition to the previous, the following conventions have also been used in the text and in the apparatus:

*om.* omitted, where the *lemma* is present in T but omitted/not present in the manuscript of at least one other witness, for example: 1 nu] *om. DE²E¹JM; it can be assumed from this example that nu is not only present in T but also in L.*

*line om.* line omitted, where the line in T is not present in one or more of the other manuscripts, for example: 13 *line om. M*

*add(s)* add(s)/is present after the *lemma* in at least one other witness, for example: 10 ido] *adds and M*

*trs.* transpose(s); usually this is a reference to adjacent words where the words are ‘reversed’ or ‘swapped’, for example 6 biđenche me] *trs. LDE²E¹JM; but it is sometimes a pair of nouns ‘trs. nouns’, for example 199 [burst and hunger] *trs.*
nouns D (where the reading in D is a variant of hunger and þurst) or phrase(s) ‘trs. phrs’. For example 274 mid ... helle] trs. phrs. M (where the reading in M is in helle mid him): see also before and after.

before

the reading is before/after; this is used throughout the notes to indicate the position of a word in a variant where trs. does not adequately express the positioning within the line, for example: 18 isien ... me] me before iseo M, where the reading in M is me iseo before. In addition, both are also used to help indicate the nature of manuscript features (typically corrections) made to words, phrases and individual letters, for example 16 unhalœ] e subp. after l in un helœ L.

after

prec.

the reading precedes, for example 92 don] prec. two or three words exp.

foll.

the reading follows, for example III werkes] foll. werhes canc. (crossed through) L

canc.

cancelled, usually by being crossed through, for example: 2 wit] ich canc. (crossed through) wit written in margin (later hand?) L; but also, occasionally, by underlining, for example 207 muze] prec. rewen canc. (by underlining).

subp.

subpuncted, for example: 16 unhalœ] e subp. after l in un helœ L

exp.

expunged, for example: 31 ne] prec. by ne exp. (very faint)

eras.

erasure, for example: 25 oðer] over eras. E

illeg.

illegible, for example: 14 folʒeð] þ in folʒeþ written over something now

illeg. E

line trs.

line transposed: this line occurs in a different order/place in at least one other manuscript, for example: 83 and 84 line trs. D, where the order in D is reversed.
couplet trs.  
couplet transposed: the order of the couplets is reversed in the stated manuscript, for example: 43–44 couplet trs. 45–46 D (D81–88 dip., D43–44 and D41–42 reg., Ω44–Ω47 parallel). Bracketed numbers refer to the line numbering in both the diplomatic edition (dip.) and the parallel text edition (parallel); in both L and D there is also a regularized number (reg.), as both of these texts (one written as prose and the other in half lines) have been written out in long lines (parallel) for the purpose of comparison.

int.  
interlineated, for example: 38 bih\ˈteð] a subp. with o int.

]  
separates the lemma from the manuscript reading, e.g.

{}  
angle brackets enclose letters or words that are illegible in the manuscript of T as the result of physical damage. The nature of this damage (e.g. cropping) will not be commented on within the notes to this edition but can be found in the diplomatic editions.

[]  
square brackets enclose letters or words that are not in the manuscript, and are either emendations or words supplied conjecturally to make sense of the line, as indicated in the apparatus.

\  
indicate interlineations, in either the text of T, where it is included in the main body of text but not usually in the apparatus, for example: ‘we solden’ (47), or of a variant, where it is only shown in the apparatus, for example: 4 ðeih]

\pah\ˈL

A bold font indicates illumination or rubrication.
The Conduct of Life in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS. McClean 123 is prefaced by two lines from The Wages of Sin (numbered Ω and Ωii in the Parallel Text Edition) and reproduced below. These lines are very similar to the first six lines of the version found in Oxford Jesus College MS 29, item 4, which follows the Conduct on the same quire.

[pr] holi goste meste us alle helpe and drihte us wisse and us teche.

Y scille us fram þe unwytte bi daie and bi niȝte þat þencel us þijche.

\[\text{Parallel Text Edition}\]

\[\text{Conduct of Life}\]
Pe þe him selfe forȝiet for wive ðoder for childe
He sal cumen on evel stede, bute him God be milde.
Sende god bifenon him þe hwile he mai, to heune,
For betre is on almesse bifenon þan ben after seuenæ.
Ne bie þe leure þe þe self ne þi þei ne þi mowe,
Sot is þe þe ðoder mannes frend betere þan his owen.
Ne hopie wif to hire were ne were to his wiue,
Be for himselfe afric man þe hwile he beo ðealde.
Wis þe hemsleue biðeneð þe hwile he mot libben,
For some willeð him forȝiȝete þe fremde and þe sibbe.
þe wel ne doð þe hwile he mai ne sal he þan he wolde.
For maniminnes sore iswinc habbed ofte unholde.
Ne solde no man don a furst ne laten wel to done,
For mani man bih ôteð wel þat hi forȝiȝete sone.
þe man þe wile siker ben to habben Godes blisse,
Do wel himselfe þe hwile he mai, panne haudeð hes mid iwisse.
Þe riche men wened siker ben þu rþ þe wallen and thurh diken;
He ðeð his aihte an siker stede þe hit sent to heueriche.
For þar ne þar þe he ben ofdrad of fure ne of þieue,
Par ne mai hit him biiname þe loðe ne þe lieuæ,
Par ne þarþ þe habben care of here ne of þyelde:
Pider we sended and ec bereð to litel and to selde.
Pider we solden dræwen, and don wel ofte and ilome;
For þar ne sal me us naht biiname mid wrongwise dome.

For ne mai hit us binime, no king ne no syrewe.  
Al þat beste þat we habbed þer, þider we solde sende,  
For þær we mihtete fynden eft, and habben aberut ende.  
Se þe her doð ani god for ‘to’ haben Godes ore  
Al he hit sal eft finde þær, and hunredreafdele more.  
Se þær aihte wile h’o’lde wele þe hwile hes muȝe wealden,  
3ieue hes for Godes luue, þanne doð hes wele wylde hen.  
For ure swinch and ure tilãe is ofte wunet to swinde  
Ac al þat we þieueð for godes luue, al we hit sulen eft finde.  
Ne sal þær non euel ben unboht, ne god unforȝolden:  
Euel we doð al to muchel, and god lasse þan we solden.  
Se þe mað doð nu to gode, and se last to tele,  
Eiðer to telite and to muchel hem sal þunche boðe.  
Par me sal ure werkes weigen before þan heuen Kinge  
And þieuen us ure werkes lean after ure erninge.  

Afric hund mid þat he hauðe mai bugge heueriche:  
Þe þe more haueð and þe þe lasse, boðe ILLISECONDS;  
Alse on mid his peni se oðer mid his punde.  
Pis is þet wunderlukeste ware þat ani man funde,  
And se þe more ne mai don mid his gode þiŋke,  
Alse well se þe hauðed goldes fele manke.  
And ofte God can more þanc þan þe him þieueð lasse;  
Al his werkes and his weyes is milce and rihtwinesse.  

Litel loc is Gode lef þe cumed of gode wille,  
And ëlalate muchel þieue þan his herte is ile.  
Heuene and erde he ouersið his ein beð ful brihte.  

50 for] om. M add ß þer DEïEJM ne] om. D mai] adds þet L hit hit E1 us binime ou binimene L1 bi nimen ecow (preci. a letter exp.) E2 nol] om. LM þe E1E1 ne no syrewe ne reue L ne h’is serreue D, ne se ireue E2, ne þe scrivre E1  
51 al] om. DE2 beste [aireste we] over erasure E2, man M habbed LE2, hoȝeð D, haueð M her] om. LDEïEJM þider] to gode M we he M, add hit LM 52 for] om. M we mihte we hit mihtete LE1, we myȝhten hit D, we it muwen E, he hit miȝte M habben adds euerre E, adds ðo-  
aler idle þe ðer, boðei miȝe lìllie E1E1; ah nohtu all lìlleiche J 67 alþe also] also LE1, he also E1, þe þer M, þe asw þon þen M peni þ’þeþeþe þe oþer] also oþer L, se þe oþer E1E1, þe þe riche, also þe þer M 68 þis] þet LDEïE1M wunderlukeste alþhe beste M ware] cheþ L, þare E1E1 ani mane] euer was JM 69 funde] etre funde LDEïE1M 69 line om. M more] namore after ne mai M don] adds do hit L, adds bute E1 70 line om. J þe þe þe E1E1, he þat M hauðed adds of M manke] marke E1 71 and] vor M ofte] om. E1E1 God] god E1E1 73] ðanca ðoll by þo subp. E1 (this is the initial letter of the following word) þan þe ... þieueþ E1E1 þe þat  
yeþum him J, him þat M 72 al] and L, þet M and] adds alþe D weires] æftes J ðelle M, om. M, mihte D and is in J rihtwinesse] ritifynesse sic E1E1 73 no variation in this line 74 and ... þieueþ] and  
litel he let on muchel wove J þieueþ adds of L, adds of him M þan þe E1E1D, þer þe J, þat his M 75 ouersið] ouer sið holte  ful brihte] swa brihte LDEïE1M, wele  
brieþe M fal in all other MSS by a line not present in T. The line in L is sunne and mone and hounen for boþ þestre ðe þe  
lihte; the variants in the other texts (against L) are and] om. E1E1 hounen for] aller sterren D, dei and fur E1E1, heuene and fur J,  
sterre and fur M boð] is M ÿeain on D, to ÿanes E1E1M
Nis him no þing forholen, swo muchel is his mihte,  
Ne bie hit no swo derne idon ne on swo juster nihte,  
Wehort hwat þencheð and hwat doð alle quike wihte.  
Ω80

Nis louerd swich is Crist, ne king swich ure Drihte,  
Boðe giemeth þe his bien bi daie and bi nihte.  
80

Heuene and erðe, and al þat is, biloken is in his honden,  
He doð al þat his will is a watere and a londe;  
He maketh þe fisses in þe sa þe fueles on þe lofte;  
He wit and wealdöð alle þing and he sop alle safte.  
Ω90

He is ord abuten ord, and ende abuten ende,  
He is one afre on eche stede wende þar þu wende;  
He is buuen us and bifornen, biforn and bihinde,  
ºð Godes wille doð ðiawhere he maþ him finde.  
85

Elche rune he hered, and he wot alle dade,  
He þurhþið elches mannes þanc. wi hwat sal us to rade  
We þe breketh Godes has and gultþe swo illome?  
Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don at þe muchele dome,  
We þe luueden unriht and euell lif laden?  
Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don þar þangles þeð oðfradde?  
Hwat sulle we beren us bifornen, mid hwan sulle we iqueme,  
Ω100

We þe nafre god ne duden, þan heuenelec Deme?  
95

Par sulen ben deflen swo fele þat willeð us forwreien,  
Nabbede hie no þing forzeten of þat hie her isieen,  
Al þat hie isieen her hie willeð cuðen þare,  
Bute we haben hit ibet þe hwile we here waren,  
100

Al hie habbeð on here write þat we misduden here,


\[\text{\textcopyright 2021}\]
Pat he ne muȝe þanne bidden ore, for þat itit ilome; 125  \( \Omega \) 130

Forþi [is] he wis þe bit and byȝiet and bet before Dome.

ðanne þe dead is at þe dure, wel late he bidded ore;

Wel late he lateð euel welc þen he hit ne mai don no more.

Senn lat þe and þu nah him, þan þu hit ne miht do no more;

Forþi he is sot þe swo abit to habben Goddes ore.

Þeih hwedere we hit leueð wel, for Drihte self hit sade,

Elche time sal þe þan of þunche his misdade, 130

Oðer raðer oðer later, milce he sal imete.

Ac þe her naued ðet, muchel he haued to bete.

Maniman seið hwo reche ðine þe sal habben ende:

'Ne bidde Ich no bet bie Ích alesed a domesdai of bende?'

Litel wot he 'h'wat is pine, and litel he knoweð

Hwical hit is þar solew wunieð, hwu biter wind þar bloweð;

Hadde he ben þar on oðer two bare tiden.

Nolde he for al middeard þe þride þar abiden.

Pat habbed isaid þe come þanne þe it wiste mid wisse:

'Wó wurde sooðe seue þier for seunheithe blissese,

And ure blissse þe ende haued for endelease pine!'

Betere is wori water þan atter imengd mid wine.

Swines brade is wel swete, swo is of wilde diere;

Ac al to diere he hit abuíð þe ȝieʃô þar for his swiere.

Ful wome mai lichtþile spchen of hunger and of fasten,

Swo mai of þine þe not hwat is pine þe sal iachuset.

---

Hadda [he] fonded some stundene he wolde segegen oder:

Eölata him ware wiif and child, suster and fader and broder.
Al he wolde oder luker don and oder luker penche,
Pan he biðohte an helle fur þat nowiht ne mai quenche;
Afre he wolde her in wo and in wane wuniene.

Wið þan he mihte helle fur biflen and bisunien.

Eölata him ware al wele and erdeliche blisse
For to þe muchele blisse come, þis is murie mis iwisise.
Ich wulle nu cumen eft to þe Dome, þe Ich eow ar of sade:
On þe daie and on þe Dome us helpe Crist and raide!
Par we muȝen ben sore offerd and harde us ofdrade;
Par elcch sal al isien him biforen his word, and ec his dade;
Al sal þar ben þanne cuð þat men luȝen her and halen,
Al sal þar ben þanne unwrïen þat men her hudden and stalen.
We sullen alre manne lif icwonne alre oȝen:

Par sullen efnings ben to þe heare and to þe loȝe;
Ne sal þeih no man samie þar ne þarf he him adrade
þeif him her ofpincheð his gult and bet his misadade;
For hem ne sameð ne ne gamede þulle sulle iboreþe
Ac þe oder habbed same and grame, and oder fele soreþe.
Þe Dom sal ben sone iden; ne hit last nowiht longe.
Ne sal Him no man mene þar of strenæde ne of wronge.
Þo sulle habben harnde dom þe here wære harde,
Þo þe eul hieldeen wrecche men and euel laȝe aðerde.
E[ch] efter þat he haued idon sal þar ben þanne idemde:

Then he had been willing to do it after all the hurt.
The heuferic he sulle fare forð mid ure Drihte;
He sulle fare forð mid him into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Par he sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft Crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellic ðeih hem be wo and ðeih hem be uneaðe;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Nare no man elles dead ne sic, ne unsele
Ac mihtle libbe afoemo a blissse and an hale.

Litel lac is Gode lief þe cumed of gode wille,
And ðolate muchel þeue þan his herte is ille.
Litel hit þunched manimman, ac muchal was þe senne
For þawan alle þoliþed ðe þecom of here kenne.
For senne, and ec ðre ozen, us muþe sore ofpuche;
For senne we libðe alle her in soreþe and in swunche,
Seðen God nam swo mukel wrache for one misedede.
We þe swo ofte misdoð, we muþzen us eade ofdrade.
Adam and al his ofspreng for one bare senne
Was fele hundred wintre an helle a pine and unwenne.
Po þe ladeð here lif mid unrihte and mid wrongful
But hit Godes milce do hie, sulle wunie þar longe.
Godes wisdom is wel muchel, and alse is his mihte,
Ac nis his mihte nowiht lasse, ac biðer ilke wihtne:
More he one maþe forþjeue þan alle folc gulte cuñe:
Self deuel mihte habben milce, þieft he hit bigunne.
þe þe Godes milche secð iw is he mai hes vinden;
Ac helle king is orleas wið þo þe he mai binden.
Se þo þis wille mast, he saþal habbe werest mede:
His baþal se þalle llinde pich, his bed barmende glede.
Wersse he doð his gode wines þan þis fiended.
God sild þe alle Godes friþe wið swo eoele friende.

201 nare ... elles] Elles before nere M no manom noman no om. E2 ne] addan LDEEJ unsele vnele D, vn ysalþe with ysalþe canc. (crossed through) and ysele written in the right-hand margin E1, vnhele J 202 a bliss] ablis a] mýd J anan
Nafre an helle Ich ne cam, ne cumen Ich þar ne reche, 225
Peih Ich aches worelden wele þare mihte feche, 226
Peih Ich wille seggen eow þat wise men us saden 227
And a boc hit is write þar me hit mai rade; 228

f. 6v

Ic wille seggen hit þo þe hit hemself nesten, 229
And warnim hin wið here unfrume þief hie me willeð hlesten. 230
Vnderstandeð nu to meward, eadimen and arme, 231
Ich wille tellen eow of helle pine and warnin eow wið harme. 232
An helle hunger and þurst euel two iferen; 233
þes pine þolied þo þe ware mete niðinges here. 234
þar is woning and wop, after ache strate; 235
(Híe fareð fram hate [to] chele, fram chele to hate; 236
ð)an hie béð in þe hate - chele hie þuncheð blisse, 237
ð)an hie cumèd eft to chele of hate hie habbeð missë! 238
(Eider doð 'hem' wo inoh, nabbeð hie none lisse; 239
(N)iten hweðer hem doð wers to nafre non wisse. 240
ð)an hie sçched reste, ac hie hes ne muþen imeten, 241
(F)or þi þe hie nolde, þe hwile hie mihten here, senne beten; 242
ð)an hie séch' eð caste þar non nis, ac hie hies ne muþen ifinden, 243
(À)c waleð weiri up and dun, se water doð mid winde. 244
ð)at béð þo þe waren her an þanc unstedefaste 245
(À)nd þe þo ðe Godë bihëten aïhte and hit him ilaste,
AND TO GOD WERC BIGUNNEN AND FUL ENDIN HIT NOLDEN,
NU WAREN HER AND NU BAR, AND NESTEN HWAT HE WOLDEN,
BAR IS PICH BAT AFRE WALLDE BAR SULLE WUNEN INNE.
BO PE LADEÐ HERE LIF ON WERRE AND AN UNWINNE.
BAR IS FUR BAT IS HUNDREDFEALD HATERE ÞAN BE URE;
NE MAI HIT QUENCHE SALT WATER; NE AEUNE STREAM NE STURE;
DIS IS ÞAT FUR BAT AFRE BARNED, NE MAI HIT NOWIHT QUENCHE.
BAR INNE BEÔ ÞE WAS TO LEN WRECHE MEN TO SWENECHE.

PO ÞE SWIKELE MEN AND FUL OF EULE WRENCHEN,
AND ÞO ÞE MIHTEN EUEL DON AND LIEF HIT WAS TO ÞENCHEN.
LEEUDEON RAUSING AND STAEL, HORDOM AND DRUKEN;
AND AN DELFES WERKES BLÜDELIKE SWUNKEN;
PO ÞE WAREN SWÓ LAUSE MEN ÞAT ME NES MEHTHE LEUEN,
MEDIHIERNE DOMEN MEN AND WÝRONSEWISE REUEN;
ÞO PO ÔDER MANNES WIF WAS LIEF HER ÔGEN ÚDLATE.
AND ÞO ÞE SUNEGEDEN MUCHEL ON DRUKEN AND ON ATE;
PE WRECHE MEN BINOMEN HERE AIHTE AND LEIDE HIS ON HORDE,
PÉ ITEL LETE OF GODES BODE AND OF GODES WORDE,
AND ÞE ÔGEN NOLDE ZIEUE ÞAR HEISE ÞE NIEDE
NÉ NOLDE IHIRE GODES MEN ÞAN HE SAT AT HIS BIEDE;
PO ÞE ÔDER MANNES ÞING LEUERE ÞAN HIT SOLDE
AND WAREN AL TO GRADI OF SIILTER AND OF GOLDE;
PO ÞE UNTRÆNNESSSE DEDEN ÞAN ÞE HE SOLDEN BEN HOLDE
And leten al þat hie seldon don, and deden þat hie wolden;
Pø þe waren þëtceres of þis wereldes æhte
And dude al þat þe lode gost hem tihte to and taiht;
And al þo þe ani wise deaul iquedem:
Pø beø mid hem in helle fordóm and demde,
Bute þo þe ofðuhte sore here misdade
And gunne here gultes bete and betere lif lade.
Par beø naddren and snaken, eueten and fruden
Þe teredø and fretedø þo eule swiken, þe niðulfæ and þe prude!
Nafre sunne þar ne sineð ne mone ne storre;
Par is muchel Godes hete and muchel godes oerre!

Afre þar is euel smeç瀚, þiesterneþe and eie;
Nis þar nafre oðer liht þan þar þe sparre leie.
Par ligeď æteliche fiend in stronge raketeie:
Þat beø þo þe waren mid god, angles swiþe heie.
Þat beø æteliche fiend and æiseliche wihten:
Þo sulle þe wrecche souwe isien þe sinegeden þurh sihte!
Par is se lode sathanas and belzebub se ealde:
Eæde he ðugen ben sore ofdrad þe sullen hes bihealde.
Ne mai non herte hit þenche, ne tunge hit ne mai telle
Hwu muchele pine ne hwu fele senden in helle.
Of þo pine þar bieð nelle Þech Iow eow naht lie.
Nis hit bute gamen and glie of þat man mai here drie
And þiet ne doð hem naht alþe wo in þe lode bende,
Swo þat he witen þat here pine sal nafre habben ende!
Par beø þe haðene men þe waren lægælease,
Pe nes naht of Godes bode no of Godes hease. Euele Cristene men hie beð here iferfen:
Po þe here Cristendom euele hielden here! And þiet beð a worse stede a niðer helle grunde,
Ne sullen nafre cumen ut, for peni ne for punde!
Ne mai hem noðer helpe þar ibede ne almesse, For naht [hie] selden bidde þar or ne forȝieuenesse!
Sild him elch man, þe while he mai, wið þôs helle pine (And) warnie his frend þar wið, swo Ich habbe ido mine.
(b)þe silde hem ne cumen, Ich hem wille tache;
(I)ch can ben aðer, þief Ich sal, lichame and sowle lache.

Late we þat God forbet alle mankenne;
And do we þat us he hat and silde we us wid senne;
Luue we God mid ure herte and mid al ure mihte
And ure emристen alse us self swo wo us tached drihte.
Al þat me radeð and singed before Godes borde,
Al hit hangeð and hault bi þese twaw worde!
Allod goddess lâges hie fullûð, þe newe and þe eald, Þe þe þos two lüues halk and wile hes wel healde.
Ac hie bieð wel aedere heed swo ofte we gult'cð alle;
For hit is strong te stonde longe, and liht hit is to falle.
Ac Drihte Crist þeue us strengeð stonde þat we moten
And of alle ure gultes þeue us come to bote. We wilniðe after wereldes wele, þe longe ne mai ilaste,
And læð mast al ure swinc on þing unstedefast.

Swunke for godes luue half þat we doð for eiehte
Nare we naht swo ofte bicherd ne swo euele bikeihte!
þief we serueden God half þat we doð for erminges
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We mihten habben more an heuene þa zierles 7 kinges!
Ne muge we werien nader ne wið þurst ne wið hunger
Ne wið elde, ne wið deað, þe elder ne þe þeungen!
Ac þar nis hunger, ne þurst, deað, ne unhalde, ne elde.
Of þesse rich we þencheð to ofte, of þare al to selde.
We solden biþenchen us wel ofte and ilome
Mid almesse mid ibeden M, we nime M.
Hwet we þe to hwan we sullen and of hwan we come.
Hwu little hwile we bieð her, hwu longe elles hware,
Hwet we þuungen habben her and hwet we findeð þare.

f. 8'
þieð [we] waren wise men þus we solden þenchen.
Bute we wurðen us iar þis wereld us wile drenchen,
Mast alle men þieued drinken of on euele senche;
(He) sal him cunnen silde wel þieft hit him nele scrænche.
Mid Almihtin Godes luue ute we us biwerien
(Wið) þess wrecches worteldes luue þat hit ne muþe us derien.
Mid almesse, mid fasten and mid ibeden werie we us wile senne,
Mid þo wapne þe God haued þieue alle mankenne.
(Late) we þe brode strate and þane wyð bene
(Þe) lat þe nieðe dai to helle of manne, me mai wene.
(Þo) we þane narwe það and þene wile grene,
(Þa) forð fareð wel litel folc, and eche is fair and isene.
(Þe) brode strate is ure wile, þe is loð te lâte;
(Þo) þe folgðð here wið, hie fareð bi þare strate.
(Þie) muþen lîhtliche cumen mid þare niðer helde
(Þu) urð one godeleæse wude to one bare felde.
(Þa) narwe það is Godes has, þar forð fareð wæl feawe;

(p)at bed þo þe him silded þierne wið achen undeawe. 350
(p)os god uneade ægien þe clue and ægien þe heie hulle;
(p)os leten al here iwil for godes luue to fulle.
(G)o we alle ðane wei, for he us wile bringe
Mid þo feawe faire men before þe heuen kinge,
(þ)ar is alre blisse mast, mid angles songe!
(þ)e is a þusend wintre þar, ne punched hit him naht longe;

Pe last haued blisse, he haued swo muche þat he ne bit no more. Ω370 f. 9'
Pe þat blisse fargod, hit sal him rewene sore!
Ne mai non eel ne non wane ben in Godes riche,
Þeih þar ben wuniinges fele, elch oðer uniliche.
Some þar habbeð lasse blisse and some þar habbeð more,
Ech after þat he dude her, after þane þe swanc sore.
Ne sal þar ben bread ne win, ne oðer kennes este,
God one sal ben ache lif and blisse and ake reste.
Ne sal þar ben foh ne grai, ne cunin ne ermine,
Ne akerne, ne metes chele, ne beuer, ne sabeline.
Ne sal þar ben nøder scat ne sru, ne werceldes wele none.
Al þe blisse þe me us bithat al hit sal ben God one;
Ne mai no blisse ben aly muchel se is Godes sihte!
He is soð sunne and briht and dai abute nihte.
He is aches godes ful, nis him no wiht uten.
Nones godes hem nis wane þe wuniæd him abuten;
Par is wele abuten wane and reste abuten swunche.
And þeih ne bed here eien naht alle ilege briht,
Hi nabbæð naht ilege muchel alle of Godes ilege:
On þesse lieu he naren naht alle of ore mihte,
Ne þar ne sullen habben God alle bi one wihte.
Þo sullen more of him isien þe luueden hine more,
And more icnowen and ec witen his mihte and his ore.
On him hie sullen findal al þat man mai to hleste,
(On him he sullen ec isien al þat hie ar nesten.
(Crist sal one bien inoʒh alle his derlinges;
(Þe one is muche more and betere þan alle oðer þinges!
(Iþoh he haueð þe hine haueð þe alle þing wealdəð.
(Ôf him to isiene nis non sæd, swo fair
(þe hine bi healde
Notes:

1-4: The deliberately ethopoeiac character of this first-person narrator is introduced. The narrator’s inclusion grounds the text and provides a focus for the sermon. He would be a physical example of what is at stake. His body is the representation of the transience of life and is therefore identified with the choices that are to be made.

Age and wisdom are juxtaposed in these first lines and the narrator is found wanting on account of age. The idea of being childlike, as a sinner, is introduced. The idea of being a ‘child’ or ‘childlike’ are repetitive themes within the opening of the sermon (Lines 3, 4, 7 and 10).

3-6: A similar construction is found in *An Orison of our Lady*: ‘To longe ich habbe sot ibeo | Wel sore ich me adrade’ (Morris 1872 no 21/31-32).

6: The consequences of an idle life are foreshadowed through the narrator’s own ‘adrede’.

7: The ‘sin’ of being as a ‘child’ or ‘chilce’ is once more repeated. The author contrasts the old age of the speaker with the immaturity of his actions.

8: Repentance is insufficient without God’s mercy.

9: The sin of being ‘idel’ is repeated (Line 6) but this time through sinful speech.

10: The theme of the sinner acting as a child is repeated (lines 3, 4, 7), as is the need for individual repentance. A similar construction is found in *A Prayer to our Lady*: ‘and wel feole sunne ido þe me ofþincheð nuðe.’ (Morris 1872 no 27/31)

11: A similar construction is found in *A Prayer to our Lady*: ‘Ifurn ich habbe isunehed mid worke and mid worde.’ (Morris 1872 no 27/21)

12: The author of the *Conduct of Life* focuses on the transience of earthly life throughout the text (see lines 43-44 and Matthew 6: 19-21). A similar construction is once more
found in *A Prayer to our Lady*: ‘muchel ich habbe ispend ‚ to lite ich habbe an horde.’ (Morris 1872 no 27/24)

13: A change has been effected in the speaker. The narrator demonstrates a movement from one state to another.

14: The audience is instructed that he cannot trust his own will as it is deceptive. It is not enough for an individual to live his life how he wants.

15-16: Through these lines the author demonstrates an ironical view of life and cautions against it: if he had the ability or willingness to discriminate between right and wrong when younger he might have lived a more productive life. However, this skill seems to be a learnt capacity that comes with age - a period in life when one has less dynamic ability to affect one’s surroundings. For the narrator, age is a very real physical manifestation and one, it would seem, that is relative to his spiritual status.

17: Serves as an expression of the transience of life. That old age may always seem a long way off but is not, adds to the urgency of his message.

18: The failing eyesight of the narrator can be seen as both physical and metaphorical (see also the notes to lines 1-4). The narrator’s vision is clouded by smoke which can be read both as the failing of his sight and also the approaching smoke of hell. It should also be read in relation to the beatific vision at the end of the text (379-380).

This study believes, as does Hill, that the ‘smeche’ and ‘miste’ of line 18 ‘probably refer figuratively to the blinding of the sight by affection for the fleshly sins of this world’. Hill goes on to cite an extract from *Gregory’s Dialogue* to validate her point.\footnote{Hill 1977, p. 117.}
19-20: The idea that evil is more alluring than good is conveyed and that men concentrate too much on this world without looking ahead to the next.

21-22: This elementary Christian principle has its basis in Galatians 6: 8. Although the Conduct of Life draws on other idioms, maxims or sapiential phraseology in its creation, it is this central theme that informs the sermon as a whole.

24-25: Repentance and salvation is a personal journey; the choices that are to be made are exclusive even when it comes to family; the idea is promoted that everyone is responsible for their own actions and that the personal relationship that an individual has with God is above that of family (wife and children).

27-28: The Conduct of Life is distinctive in that it does not recommend gifts for the souls of the dead. The text is firmly situated in this life and the giving of alms in the present rather than any form of intercession for the afterlife.

30-34: The giving of wealth in the previous lines is linked in the Conduct of Life with the renunciation of kin (see also lines 23-24).

36: Hall believes that the possible source of this line is Psalm 108: 11.819

41-42: Heaven is described as a financial safe-house so as to play upon the audience’s fears and grievances in this world. The text states that the person who lays up his wealth in Heaven through alms-giving does so with the knowledge that it will be safe from this world’s insecurities (See also lines 43-44)

43-44: Heaven is described as an absence of negatives; an absence, in the first place, of earthly affliction (in this case the threat of fire and theft). It is reliant on what the audience fear most in this world rather than a description of a geographical place. This is because it is beyond the reach of imagination. It can only be described in terms of the

---

human condition and therefore is represented by what it is not rather than what it is. (This is a formula that re-occurs throughout the sermon at lines 48, 50, 359 and 373-374) Heaven and Hell are depicted as opposites: if Hell is the extreme of all that is negative in life, then Heaven is the opposite – a negation of any kind of suffering. Hell is firmly based on the corporeal and therefore Heaven manifests itself as the spiritual.

A major emphasis in the *Conduct of Life* is on the transience of earthly wealth. It would seem that the author of the *Conduct of Life* takes his basic teaching for these lines from Matthew 6:19-21.

**48:** We find, once again, similar threats to earthly wealth that are *not* present in Heaven but are reliant on the person’s actions in this life.

**50:** Once more, as in 48, heaven is described as an absence of an earthly threat. The chapter from Matthew which informs the lines 43-44 continues here:

> Nemo potest duobus dominis servire aut enim unum odio habebit et alterum diligent aut unum sustinebit et alterum contemned non potestis Deo servire et mamoneae (6:24)

[No man can serve two masters. For either he will hate the one, and love the other; or he will sustain one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon.]

The divided allegiance to two masters, one spiritual and one a false god of avarice, is also present in the text of the *Conduct of Life* and it would seem that the author is attributing the role of Mammon to the authorities at local and national level – highlighting a friction between Church and the baronial system of governance. Hill claims that line 50 ‘reflects the unjust seizure of worldly goods by the king and his sheriff.’ Hill 1977, p. 122.

It would seem that the author is juxtaposing the giving of wealth to those who govern with the giving of alms to the Church. The figure of the sheriff or reeve

---

becomes in many eleventh- and twelfth-century homilies a symbol of earthly power, ‘unscrupulous and extortionate, whose iniquities and severities are roundly condemned by the preacher’.  

70: ‘manke’: either a. A money of account used in various parts of western Europe between the 8th and 12th centuries, and in England equivalent to thirty silver pence, two and a half twelve-pence shillings, or six five-pence shillings. Also: (the name of) a coin of this value. b. A unit of weight (esp. of gold) equivalent to the weight of thirty silver pence. OE mancus. The mancus was ‘not current coin but merely money of account’.  

82: watere ... londe. This is a common formula also found in The Passion of our Lord, ‘Vor hi by-nomen him saulen in water. and in londe.’ (Morris 1872 no 1/682) and Doomsday, ‘Boþe in þe water and in þat lond.’ (Morris 1872 no 22/13)  

92-136: This section of the text concentrates primarily on the representation of individual judgement. The author concentrates on the ultimate result of choices made in this life through his description of Hell and Heaven, which follow. The idea of individual choices is reiterated throughout the text. The emphasis for the author of the Conduct of Life is on an individual relationship with God and this is emphasized in the section concerning individual judgement.  

92-96: The movement in this sequence is successful in portraying man’s weakness when faced with the prospect of Judgement Day. The author achieves this through a series of rhetorical questions which once more include himself in his audience. Through the

---

824 See Hall, Selections from early Middle English, Notes p.335.
personal pronoun ‘we’, the narrator, once more adopts the same struggles and sins as his audience.

94: See note to lines 97-102.

92-93: The transience of earthly belongings is once more emphasized in this section (see note on individual judgement, lines 92-136).

97-102: These lines are similar to those found in Vercelli Homily ii and Vercelli Homily x in that it is the devil himself who acts as the accuser and prosecutor on Judgement Day. The Final Judgement being played out like a court-room drama also has antecedents in Old English literature, most notably in Vercelli Homily IV. However, although the accusations in the Conduct of Life may be made by many devils, the Judgement will ultimately be an individual act (see note to 107).

100: the use of the pp. ibet and the pa. tense weren alongside the pron second sg. we is essential to a reading of the text at this point: the narrator has already established himself as part of the audience through the use of the inclusive pron we (see note to lines 92-96) and the use of rhetorical questions which drive the narrative forward and call upon the audience to examine themselves in light of the judgement to come. This is followed in the text by a comparison with a list of the truly sinful and the question: Hwat sullen horlinges don, þes wichen and þe forsworene? (line 103). The preacher draws the audience into a position of association and, therefore, of choice. They can either be part of the ‘we’ and therefore acknowledge their sins and be brought to repentance or be part of the group whose sins are extreme and Þe sulle ben to deaðe idemd and afremo forlorene (line 106). In fact, the preacher has made the choice for them. The use of the past tense in line 100 suggests that the preacher assumes that no

one would make a choice other than repentance. He has brought the audience with him to a point where their assumed wills have become merged with his; they cannot escape the rationality of such a choice because he cannot.

105-106: These lines are reminiscent of Jeremias 20: 18. 826

107-116: The trial and judgement is personal and the responsibility is individual: a key theme throughout the sermon. The scene continues with its legal imagery (see note to lines 97-101) in line 107 and 108. The narrator acts as a guide taking the audience so far, accompanying the reader/listener but ultimately leaving them alone to face God.

124-129: The author does not make a distinction between death and Doomsday. As discussed in relation to the lines 92ff., the text does not advocate the giving of gifts for the souls of the dead and the author does not recommend either the role of intercessory prayers. The emphasis for the author of the Conduct of Life is on the actions of the individual in this life.

131-132: This is probably a reference to Isaiah 55: 7.

137: Hell is represented in terms of inexpressibility. The torments and terrors of Hell are so horrible that human beings cannot do justice to them in their descriptions. (Compare notes to lines 289-290).

138: Images of suffering through cold would possibly have had more of a resonance for this audience than for one from a more temperate climate.

139-140: The emphasis in the Conduct of Life is on the eternity of the punishments in hell, which parallel the themes of the transience of this earthly life described elsewhere in the text. The author continuously juxtaposes the temporary pleasures of this life with the never-ending tortures of Hell, in order to reiterate his message of penitence. Lines

826 See Hill 1977, p. 119.
139-140 emphasise not only the pain and torments but also our inability in this life to comprehend them.

141: This line appears to be present at this point within the verse sermon in order to give authority to the descriptions that have preceded it - through an implied familiarity with visionary texts and with visionary culture, written or oral, not only by the author, but also by his audience.

142: This line implies that, once in Hell, the soul would perform any required action to be granted a respite from the torture. This is a conception that is most recognisably found in the *Visio Sancti Pauli* where Paul secures a weekly respite for the damned on Sunday. However, it is also a motif found in other texts such as *Vercelli Homily IX* where the sinner would rather hang from a tree on the cliff-side for seven-thousand years rather than return to Hell. It is also apparent in the *Nauigatio s. Brendani* where Judas’s ‘break’ from hell is to crouch on a rock in the middle of the sea, which, as he tells St Brendan, is a relief from the harsher torments of Hell.

143: The author of the *Conduct of Life* returns to the reality of this world in this line, convincingly inverting the choice, which has been removed from those already in Hell.

144: Suggests an earthly example of how to avoid an eternity of damnation. Line 144 advocates a belief in self-denial that may be viewed as asceticism (see also line 335). The sanctity of the soul is placed above the well-being of the body (see also line 339).

145-146: These lines appear to demonstrate contemporary concerns, possibly relevant to the audience of the *Conduct of Life*. These lines are examined closely by Hill.\(^\text{827}\)

---

\(^{827}\) Hill 1977, p.122.
150: These lines may be linked to the renunciation of kin in lines 23-25 and the giving of alms in lines 29-34. They focus on the individual nature of repentance and salvation; for the author what is at stake is the salvation of one’s soul and either an eternity of bliss or damnation. The lines are consistent with the idea of individual contrition advanced throughout the sermon.

151-152: These lines suggest, not only a punishment familiar to the audience, as the narrator urges them to contemplate a concept or a pain already known to them, but also one that is beyond their imagination as the pain is unending; a torment that cannot be ‘quenchen’ (See also line 251).

153: wo ... wane: Hall evidences this as a formal combination giving a further example of its use from Saint Juliana.

155-156: Maxims such as the ones that are present in these lines, and line 319, that express the transient nature of life, are reminiscent of the Old English poetic tradition.

161-162: See 1 Corinthians 4: 5.

168: same and grame: the same combination is found in Sinners Beware, ‘Þu vs hauest iвроht þes schome. | And alle þene eche grome.’ (Morris 1872 no /332)

175-176: For a discussion of the re-appropriation of the Old Testament figure of Adam, Salvation History, the Harrowing of Hell and ideas of transience see notes to lines 182-186 and 197-202.

177-181: Life is presented as a journey with two possible outcomes and two different ‘guides’. The decisions are to be made in this world.

180: References to ‘helle grunde’ are similarly found in Quadragesima Sunday (Morris 1868 no 2/8 and 35)

828 See Hall, Selections from early Middle English, Notes p.339.
182-186: The author of the *Conduct of Life* weighs the love and sacrifice of Christ against the actions of Satan who is responsible for the sinful state of mankind. He achieves this by relating how Christianity has transformed and redeemed the Old Testament figure of Adam through the Passion and through the popular medieval idea of the Harrowing of Hell. The eternity of hell for the sinner is therefore reinforced by the statement that is made in line 182 of the *Conduct of Life*, the idea that choices that are made now are final.

197-202: The author of the *Conduct of Life* also makes the association between Adam’s first sin and the ailments of life. (See also notes to the Harrowing 182-186).

199: The absence of these torments (hunger and thirst) in heaven are subsequently found in line 325, ‘ne pið þurst ne pið hunger’. The pairing of torments, according to Teresi’s study of *Mnemonic transmission of Old English texts*, ‘such as hunger and thirst, or cold and heat is a popular descriptive pattern, at least as far as anonymous homilies are concerned.’ She goes on to contend that these ‘lists of statements’ are close to the modes of oral tradition’. A similar pairing is found in *The Passion of Our Lord* where it is ‘Þurst. and hunger. chele. and hete. ðis beoþ strong pyne.’ (Morris 1872 no 1/9)

225: Although similarities can be demonstrated between the *Conduct of Life* and much of the visionary material in circulation at this time, including the use of a first person narrator who acts like a guide for the audience urging them to repentance, this line states that the narrator has not visited hell personally. That he makes this statement is noteworthy in distancing the *Conduct of Life* from visionary literature.

---

829 Her discussion is in relation to the anonymous homily *Be Heofonwarum* and focuses on the possibility of mnemonic transmission within this text. Teresi, *Mnemonic transmission of Old English texts*, pp. III-112.
227-228: A literary tradition for visions of Hell is clearly highlighted in these lines. Books are used as authority and a familiarity with this tradition is firmly established (see also lines 141 and 225). See also a similar line in *The Passion of Our Lord*, 'Hit is write in þe bok. þer me hit may rede.' (Morris 1872 no 1/131)

233-234: In the *Conduct of Life* the sin of gluttony warrants a special punishment commensurate with the act. Throughout the text food and drink are emphasised as sins associated with the body and fasting is a key component, during this period, in maintaining a penitential life-style that may ensure salvation. It should not be surprising therefore that commensurate punishment has been reserved in hell for those who did not observe strict practice in this life.

236-238: Scriptural authority for the alternation of heat and cold is established in Job 24: 19:

> `ad nimium calorem trangmseat ab aquis nivium et usque ad inferos peccatum illius`

[Let him pass from the snow waters to excessive heat, and his sin even to hell.]

The imagery is very similar to the *Vision of Drythelm*:

> Wes gehweðer manna saula full, þa wrixendlice on tua healfhe gesegene weeran,
> swa swa mid unমætnešes micles stormes, worpene beon. Poonne hio þæt mægn þere unmetan hætton árefnan ne mehtan, þonne stældan heo eft earmlice in middel þæs unmetan ciles. 7 mid þy heo ðær næmige reste gemetan mihtan, þonne stældon heo eft in middan þæs byrnendan fyres 7 þæs unadwæscedan leges. 830

[Both were full of men's souls, which seemed to be cast to either side in turn, as though by the overpowering violence of a great storm. When they could not endure the force of the excessive heat, they sprang away in their misery into the midst of the excessive cold. And when they could find no rest there, they sprang back into the midst of the burning fire and the unquenchable flame] 831

See also lines 138 and 244, and the note to line 199 for the pairing of torments.

241: The idea of walking and seeking rest in this line is ultimately tied to Luke 11: 24.

---

831 *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of The English People*, 425 ll. 26-32
243-244: These lines contain the punishment for the sins that occur in lines 245 and 248 and reflect a correlation between punishment and sin (see notes to lines 233 and 234 for the progressive ideas of this text in regard to commensurate punishment). The spiritual movement of the individual in life (lines 245-248) has been turned into a physical act of torture in Hell. In both the earthly realm and in Hell the emphasis is on movement. On earth those accused of this sin knew not what they desired and yet in Hell it has become intensely clear that what is being sought is ‘reste’ (see also 241) and therefore God (poena sensus) but this is no longer an option for them. The choice is one that is made in this life.

Hill draws a comparison between line 244 and the section from Bede referenced previously832 (lines 236-238) which reports that the souls of the damned are tossed ‘se water doð mid winde.’ The movement of the souls is similar to the idea in the Vision of Drythelm of the souls being moved as if by a violent storm. (See also line 138)

244-245: The ultimate source for these lines is James 1: 6 and 8.

245-248: For those who in their thoughts were ‘unstedefaste’ (line 245), made vows to God and would not perform them (line 246) and who began good works and would not complete them (line 247), the punishment is to reflect the crime. Line 248 proposes that in life they went here and there and didn’t know what they wanted. In Hell the punishment is constructed around a similar idea of movement (See lines 243-244).

251-253: The author is exploiting the established fears of his audience; he is taking a concept of pain already known to them and multiplying it. The unquenchable fire of Hell has antecedent in both the Old and New Testaments. Isaiah 66 locates this fire in an

832 Hill 1977, p.120.
earthly scene of punishment and judgement. Mark 9: 42-47, however, moves this source of unquenchable pain to a place beyond this life (See lines 151-152).

254: Hall sees in this line a possible ‘reminiscence of the Anarchy’. 833

277-278: It is the animal inhabitants of Hell, which ‘tered and fretd’, that are to punish those who speak evil (deceivers), the envious and the proud. The author, once again, reserves specific punishments for those who have sinned in a particular way (See notes on lines 232-234, 243-244 and 245-248 for notes on commensurate punishment in the Conduct of Life).

279: The absence of the sun and the stars equates to the absence of the means of measuring time on earth, emphasising the eternity of damnation and the absence of God, the poena damni, as ‘He is soð sunne and briht and dai abute nihte’ (line 370).

280: The Old Testament association between the fires of Hell and God’s anger, the poena sensus, (for example, Isaiah 66: 15-16) is made in the Conduct of Life at this line. (See lines 251-253)

281-282: Hell is a place of darkness. It is a place where even the flames are gloomy, a common motif in descriptions of Hell where the ‘fire is black or dark fire, burning without giving light and emitting blinding and smothering smoke’. 834 The removal of the sense of sight is also the removal of any sense of consolation or hope (See line 279).

285-287: Those who have sinned through sight will also suffer a torment that reflects their earthly action, for they will see ‘atelic fiend’ and ‘eiseliche wihten’ including ‘se loðe sathanas’ and ‘belzebub se alde’ (See notes on lines 232-234, 243-244, 245-248, 277-278 for notes on commensurate punishment in the Conduct of Life). This punishment

---

833 Hall, Selections from early Middle English, Notes p.346
834 Cavendish, p.113
of sin is of particular importance to the *Conduct of Life* as it links the idea of sight with the Devil. For ‘se ealde’, see also Apocalypse 20: 2.

289-290: The ‘tunge’ not being able effectively to articulate damnation has antecedents in earlier visions including the redactions of the *Visio Sancti Pauli*. It was also a common formula within post-Conquest texts such as in *Death* where it is written ‘Ne myhte no tunge telle. þat euer wes ibore. þe stronge pyne of helle.’ (Morris 1872 no 23/173). Further comments on the inexpressibility of hell can also be found in the notes to line 137.

292: The combination ‘gamen and glie’ is also found in *On Orison of our Lady*, ‘Ileued ich habbe gomen and gleo.’ (Morris 1872 no 21/33).

299: This line suggests a multi-layered hell, with specific torment reserved for ‘Evele Cristene men’ (line 297).

Ω311-Ω313: The immediacy of action is emphasized throughout the *Conduct of Life*, the giving of alms after death cannot buy freedom from the sufferings of hell.

303-306: In these lines the narrator of the *Conduct of Life* adapts martial language as a way of defending oneself against sin. This is one of only two direct references to the soul in the *Conduct of Life*, the second is at line 398. There is however an emphasis on the somatic throughout the text. Line 306 has led Hall to discuss whether the writer might be a ‘a priest with some knowledge of medicine’, although he concludes that he might only be ‘asserting the claim of Christianity to benefit the body as well as the soul.’  

Hill sees the line as ‘a reference to the priest’s power to save by instruction’.

---

835 See, for instance, Teressi, ‘Mnemonic Transmission of Old English Texts’, p. 112, for her discussion of this inexpressibility topos in relation to *Be Heofonwarum*.


837 Hill 1977, p.118.
309-312: These lines are ultimately derived from Matthew: 22: 40.

319-320: The transience of life is once more foregrounded. From a Christian perspective, awareness of transience has always been an aspect of eschatology, as it is in the *Conduct of Life*.

330: The idea of a journey and the choices made by the individual are questioned. (See note to line 319).

331: The author highlights the transience of this life in comparison with the eternity of the afterlife.

334-335: The devil attacks by means of intoxication. Themes of eating and drinking, gluttony and indulgence are a major presence in *Conduct of Life* and are representative of the earthly and therefore the transient. (Compare with line 144).

336-338: Although the preacher of the text believes he can ‘tache’ (line 305) the audience how to shield themselves against helle pine (line 303), ultimately salvation is secured through the protection of Almighty God. The metaphor of battle is once more employed in these lines. The ultimate source for these lines is probably Psalm 90: 4-8.

339: This again suggests a penitential practice that places an emphasis on the denial of the body in preparation for judgement (See lines 144, 334-335).

340: See lines 336-338.

341-343: These lines and many of the images contained within the following section are ultimately derived from Matthew 7: 13

359: Heaven is once more described in terms of what it is not (See lines 43-44).

365: For the combination ‘foh ne grai’, see also *The Passion of Our Lord*, ‘Ne hedde he none robe. of fowe. no of gray.’ (Morris 1872 no 1/66).
The authority upon which this line is drawn is Isaiah 60: 19–20. (Compare line 279). The idea of continuous light in Heaven can also be found in post-Conquest visionary material, including in the final book, The Land of Promise of The Saints, of St. Brendan’s Voyage and in the The Third Place of Glory of the Monk of Evesham’s Vision.

The narrator continues to use negation of what is harsh in this world as a means of describing Heaven (see lines 43–44, 48, 50, 359) The idea of Heaven being a place of ‘reste’ is common in such descriptions. It is ultimately linked with the idea of the eternal Sabbath and such New Testament lines as Revelations 14:13 and Hebrews 4: 9–10 and Genesis 2:2 from the Old Testament.

The Conduct of Life places a particular emphasis on the transitory nature of earthly life and on wealth. These are absent from the abode of the blessed. The physical degeneration of the body in life is essential to an understanding of the Conduct of Life, especially in the description of the narrator, who is suffering from the harsh realities of old age. It is, therefore, not surprising that Heaven is described in terms that negate this process (see lines 43–44, 48, 50, 359, 373).

For the author of the Conduct of Life the true essence of Heaven is the beatific vision. Importantly, for this discussion, the Beatitudes state that: ‘Blessed are the clean of heart: for they shall see God’ (Matthew 5: 8). It is usually believed that this vision of God is to occur post mortem as, in Exodus 33:20, God tells Moses, ‘And again he said: Thou canst not see my face: for man shall not see me and live.’ The Conduct of Life, it would seem, is a progressive text that, in its representation of Heaven, abandons traditional descriptions of Heaven as a City
or a Garden Paradise in favour of the souls of the blessed obtaining knowledge of everything through the sight of God.

The author of the text has focused throughout on the sensory – in particular the visual. He draws the association between the degeneration of the narrator’s sight with the transience of this world and the sin that may lead the individual to damnation. However, it is the redemptive quality of repentance that ultimately reverses the diminishing vision of the narrator. His diminished sight acts equally as a metaphor for faith, ultimately granting him a redefined idea of what ‘sight’ is through the beatific vision.

381-386: Although all of the blessed will share in the beatific vision, the level of their inclusion is dependent upon their earthly acts. What is being created is a multi-layered Heaven.

395-396: There is an ‘inexpressibility topos’ in medieval literature associated with descriptions of Heaven that can also be found in the Conduct of Life. The true Heaven, it would seem, is saved only for those who have genuinely qualified for entrance by their acts in this life, death and individual judgement.
Glossary

This Glossary is not a complete presentation of the words in the manuscripts of the *Conduct of Life* but rather aims to include all words that might cause difficulty for the reader. The glossary is keyed into the critical text.

The Headwords are arranged alphabetically; æ and ð and ʒ are treated as separate entries after a, t and g respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>ALESE see ELD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A(N) prep. in: Ω1, Ω3, Ω4 etc.</td>
<td>ALESED verb pp. released, delivered: Ω141.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABIT verb pr. 3rd sg. (contracted) abide: Ω135.</td>
<td>ALMESSE noun alms: Ω29, Ω312.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABUGE ð verb pr. 1st pl. pay for, suffer: Ω204.</td>
<td>ALSE adv. as: Ω68; ALSSE adv. also: Ω222.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABUTEN prep. without: Ω87.</td>
<td>ALTO adv. all too: Ω11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC conj. but, and: Ω17.</td>
<td>ANGLES noun pl. angels: Ω295.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHE adj. everlasting, eternal: Ω375.</td>
<td>AQUERNE noun squirrel: Ω377.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHEN adj. each: Ω244; ACHES adj. poss. each: Ω233.</td>
<td>AR adv. previously: Ω13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRE adv. ever: Ω88.</td>
<td>ARE cj. ere, before: Ω129.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFREMO adv. evermore: Ω111, Ω209.</td>
<td>AREFED-HEALD adj. pl. difficult to hold (AREFED adj. difficult + HEALD noun hold): Ω 326.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRIC adj. every: Ω33. AFRICH: Ω66.</td>
<td>ARERDE verb pa. 3rd pl. set up, founded, established: Ω179.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIHWARE adv. everywhere: Ω90.</td>
<td>ARME adj. pl. poor, needy: Ω238.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDRADE verb 1st sg. pr. to fear greatly: Ω6.</td>
<td>ATE noun eating: Ω271.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALD see ELD.</td>
<td>ATELICHE adj. pl. horrible: Ω294, Ω296.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDER see ELDER.</td>
<td>ATTER noun poison, venom: Ω151.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALGESED verb pp. released, delivered: Ω141.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Æ

ÆNES adv. once: Ω192.

ÆNGLES noun pl. angels: Ω96.

B

BAREND verb pr. 3rd sg. burns: Ω262.
BEDE (IBEDE) noun pl. prayers, supplications: Ω312.
BENDE noun pl. bonds: Ω141, Ω189, Ω197.
BENE adj. good, fair, pleasant: Ω352.
BESTE noun best: Ω52.
BET verb pr. 3rd sg. (contracted form) amends, repents: Ω131, Ω173.
BET adv. better: Ω16.
BEĐENHCHE v, pr. 1st sg. think of, consider, remember, 'bethink': Ω6;
BEUER noun beaver: Ω377.
BIEDE noun table: Ω275.
BICHERD verb pp. pl. led astray, mislead: Ω333.
BICLEPIEN verb inf. accuse: Ω112.
BIFLEN verb inf. flee, avoid, shun: Ω161.
BISIET verb pr. 3rd sg. acquire, obtain [mercy]: Ω131.
BISIETE verb pp. pl. conceived: Ω110.
BIHETEN verb pa. 3rd pl. promised, vowed: Ω254; BIHAT (cont.) verb pr. 3rd sg.: Ω379.
BIHOTED verb pr. 3rd sg. promises: Ω39.
BIKÉIHTE verb pp. pl. trapped, ensnared: Ω333.
BILOKEN verb pp. enclosed: Ω83.

C

CHELE noun cold: Ω206.
CHILCE noun childishness: Ω7.
CLIUE noun cliff: Ω362.
CUNIN noun rabbit: Ω376.

CÚNNE verb pr. 3rd pl. can: Ω224.
CÚD adj. known, (clear, plain, evident): Ω168.
CÚDE v pp 1st sg. can: Ω9.
CUĐEN verb inf. show: Ω102.
DADE (see also DO(N)) noun deed, from experience: Ω3.
DEFLEN noun pl. devils: Ω100; DEFLES noun poss. devil's: Ω267.
DEME noun judge: Ω99; DEMDE (IDEMD) verb pp. pl. sentenced, condemned, doomed: Ω111, Ω285, IDEMDE verb pp. judged: Ω180
DERIEN verb inf. hurt, harm, injure: Ω349.
DERLINGES noun pl. darlings: Ω400.
DERNE adv. secretly: Ω79.
DERE noun deer: Ω152.
DERNEN verb inf. draw: Ω48.
DRIE verb inf. endure, undergo, suffer: Ω303.
DRIHTEN: Ω192.
DURE noun door: Ω189.
EFNINGES noun pl. equals, the same: Ω171.
EFTE adv. again, once more: Ω53.
EIE noun awe, fear: Ω21, Ω292.
EISSELICHE adj. pl. fearful, terrible: Ω296.
ELCHE adj. each: Ω91.
ELDE noun old age: Ω18.
ELDER comp. older: Ω1.
ELDERNE noun pl. elders: Ω201.
EOW pron. 2nd pl. you: Ω164.
ENDE-LEASE adj. endless: Ω150.
ERNINGE vbl. noun earning, (what we deserve): Ω65.
ERMINGES noun pl. wretches: Ω334.
ERDELICHE adj. earthly: Ω162.
EST noun pleasure, enjoyment: Ω376.
EDLATE adj. worthless: Ω75; adj. pl. Ω157.
EUETEN noun pl. lizards, salamanders, newts: Ω288.
FARE verb inf. travel, go: Ω185.
FECHEN verb inf. fetch: Ω233.
FELE adj. pl. acc. many: Ω9. pron. pl.
FELE: Ω71.
FEREN (IFEREN) noun pl. companion: Ω105.
FEAWE pron. pl. few: Ω360.
FISSES noun pl. fish: Ω85.
FOH adj. part-coloured, variegated, spotted or streaked: Ω376.
FOL3ED verb pr. 3rd sg. follow: Ω14.
FONDED verb pp. sg. follow: Ω156.
FOR prep. for: Ω17.
FOREMES-FADERES noun poss.
forefather's: Ω204.
FORHOLEN verb pp. hidden, concealed: Ω78.
FORLORENE verb pp. pl. damned, lost: Ω111.
FORSWOREN noun pl. perjured: Ω108.
FOR adv. forth, movement forward: Ω185.
FORWREIEN verb inf. accuse, denounce: Ω100.
FOR3E verb pr. 3rd sg. (contracted form) forget: Ω26.
FREMDE adj as noun stranger, foreigner, not of kin: Ω35.
FRETED verb pr. 3rd pl. gnaw, consume, torture by gnawing: Ω289.
FRUDEN noun pl. frogs or toads: Ω288.
FUELES noun pl. fowl: Ω85.
FURE noun fire: Ω44, FUR: Ω159, Ω262.
FURST noun: delay, postpone: Ω38.
GLIE noun glee, entertainment, play: Ω303.
GODCUNNESSE noun divinity, divine nature or power: Ω404.
GOLDE noun gold: Ω71.
GRUND noun ground: Ω187.
GULT verb pp. sinned: Ω11; GULTE verb pr. 1st pl. sin: Ω93.
HABBE verb pr 1st sg., have: Ω7; HAUED verb pr. 3rd sg. have: 41.
HAIL noun health, well-being: Ω209.
HALE noun health, well-being: Ω209.
HALEN verb pa. 3rd pl. concealed, hid, kept secret: Ω168.
HAREM noun harm: Ω205.
HARDNE adj. hard: Ω171.
HAS noun bidding, command: Ω93, Ω360.
HAT verb pr. 3rd sg. bid, command: Ω319.
HATERE adj. comp. hotter: Ω260.
HADENE adj. pl. heathen: Ω306.
HEALEDEN (HEALEDEN) verb inf. hold: Ω57; HIELDEN verb pa. 3rd pl.: Ω179.
HEASE noun pl. bidding, command: Ω307.
HEIE adj. as noun pl. high (rich/important): Ω171.
HERE (HERE) verb inf. hear: Ω276.
HERE noun payment, wages: Ω46.
HEUENRICHE noun the Kingdom of Heaven: Ω43.
HIT pron. 3rd sg. it: Ω13.
HIE pron. 3rd pl. they: Ω23.
HINE pron. 3rd sg. him: Ω115, Ω402.
HLESTEN verb inf. listen: Ω237; HLESTE verb inf. listen: Ω398.
HOLDE adj. pl. loyal to a king or master, faithful to Christ: Ω279.
HOPIE verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg. hope: Ω32.
HORDOM noun whoredom: Ω266.
HORLINGES noun pl. fornicator, adulterer: Ω108.
HULLE noun hill: Ω362.
HUDDEN verb pa. 3rd pl. concealed: Ω169.
HUNDREDFEALDE adv. hundred times: Ω55.
HWEDERE cj. whether: Ω136.
HWILCH adj. which: Ω143.
HWILE (ǷE –HWILE) cj. while: Ω22, Ω24.

ICH personal pro. 1st sg. nom. I: Ω1, Ω2, Ω3, etc.
IFEREN noun pl. companions, servants: Ω240.
ILKE demon. adj. the same Ω223.
ILLE adj. ill: Ω75.
IUEL (JUEL) noun evil: Ω20.
IWISSE noun (with mid) certainty: Ω165.

JUEL see IUEL

KEDDE verb pa. 3rd sg. made known, shown, revealed: Ω200.
KENNE noun kin: Ω213; KENNES noun poss: Ω376.

LAC noun offering, sacrifice, gift: Ω210
LOC Ω74.
LACHE noun leech: Ω317.
LADEN verb inf. lead, carry: Ω414; LADE verb inf. lead: Ω287. LAD, LADE verb pp. led: Ω5; LADED verb pr. 3rd pl. leads: Ω220.
LATEN verb inf. to grow late: Ω38.
LASSE adv. less: Ω61.
LAST noun least: Ω62, Ω117.
LASE noun pl. laws: Ω179; LA3ELEASE adj. pl. lawless: Ω306.
LÆTE verb inf. leave behind: Ω356.
LEAN noun reward, recompense (specifically in regard to one’s eternal damnation or salvation): Ω65.
LEASE adj. pl. false, untrue: Ω268.
LEF adj. prized, approved: Ω74.
LEGED verb pr. 1st pl. lay: Ω331.
LEID verb pp. placed, laid: Ω12.
LEIE noun fire, firelight: Ω293.
LENDE verb subj. pr. 3rd sg. bring [to heaven], cause to come [to heaven]: Ω127.
LESEN verb inf. set free, deliver, release: Ω189.
LEUEN (ILEUEN) verb inf. believe: Ω50;
LEUED (ILEUED) verb pr. 1st pl. believed: Ω183.
LICHAME noun poss. body’s: Ω317;
LICHAMLICHE adj. pl. bodily, corporeal, physical: Ω415.
LICHE (ILICHE) adv. alike, the same: Ω67, Ω392.
LIBBE verb inf. live: Ω209.
LIEUE adj as noun friend, beloved, dear one: Ω45.
LIEF adj. beloved: Ω210, Ω270.
LIGED verb pr. 3rd sg. resides: Ω294.
LIBBEN verb inf. live: Ω34.
LIHTLICHE (LIHT+LICHE) adv. lightly: Ω154.
LIPNE verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg. rely, trust: Ω25.
LISSE noun love, kindness, mercy: Ω248.
LOC see LAC.

M

MAI noun kinsman: Ω194.
MAN-KENNE noun mankind: Ω351.
MANKE noun pl. unit of weight (esp. of gold): Ω71.
MANNE noun man: Ω121.
MAST adj., most: Ω7.
ME indef. pron. man: Ω49; MES: indef. pron. 3rd pl. one, person, man: Ω268.
MEDE noun reward: Ω228.
MEDSERNE adj. pl. greedy for bribes, desirous of power: Ω269.
MENE verb inf. complain, lament: Ω177.
MENGD (IMENGD) verb pp. mixed, blended: Ω151.
METE (IMETE) verb inf. meet: Ω138.
METHES CHELE noun see the notes to parallel text for this. Probable reading is ‘the red fur of the marten’ Ω377.
MID prep. with: Ω421.
MIDDLENEARD (MIDDEN+EARD) noun earth, world (middle region between heaven and hell): Ω145, MIDDENÆRD Ω202.
MIHTE noun might: Ω78.
MILCE noun acc., mercy, compassion: Ω8.
MISDEED noun pl. misdeeds: Ω137; MISDEDE noun misdeed: Ω216.
MISDUDEN verb pa. 1st pl. amiss, wrong: Ω101.
MISLICA verb pr. 3rd sg. dislike, displeases: Ω13.
MISTE noun mist: Ω19.
MOSE noun kinsman: Ω194.
MONE noun moon: Ω279.
MUCHEL adj. great, much: Ω12, Ω222; adv. much: Ω14.
MUSE verb subj. pr. 3rd sg. may: Ω24, Ω56.
MURIE adj. merry: Ω163.
MURIHDE noun mirth: Ω407.

N

NABBED verb pr. 3rd pl. have not: Ω393.
NADDREN noun pl. adders: Ω288.
NAFRE adv. never: Ω99, Ω128, Ω189.
NAHT adv. neg. not: Ω49; NAH adv. neg. not: Ω134.
NAREN verb pa. 3rd pl. were not: Ω394; NARE verb sbj. pa. 3rd sg. Ω208.
NADE verb pr. 3rd sg. (cont. neg. form of have) have not: Ω139.
NELE verb pr. 3rd sg. will not: Ω128.
NELLED verb pr. 3rd pl. will not: Ω385.
NESTEN verb pa. 3rd pl. knew not: Ω236, Ω399; NES v pa. 3rd sg. be not/knew not: Ω307.

NEWE adj. pl. new: Ω324.
NIEDE noun need: Ω274.
NISEIEN verb pa. 1st pl. saw not, did not see: Ω105.

NIÐER (A+NIÐER) adj. nether, lower or bottom part: Ω310.
NIÐFULE adj. pl. envious, malicious, spiteful, wicked: Ω289.
NOLDE verb pa. 3rd sg. would not: Ω194, Ω195.
NOWIHT adv. neg. not Ω223.
NU adv. now: Ω1; NUDE: Ω10.

OERRE noun anger, wrath: Ω291.
OFDRAD verb pp. afraid: Ω44;
OFDRADDE verb pp. pl. afraid: Ω96.
OFFERD verb pp. pl. feared, terrified: Ω166.
OF-PUNCHE verb inf. repent: Ω137
ON adj. one: Ω29 (preceding a vowel).
ONDE noun spite, hatred: Ω202
ORD noun beginning: Ω87.

ORE noun mercy, pardon, forgiveness: Ω54, Ω188; ORE-LEAS adj. merciless: Ω227.
ODER cj. or: Ω26; ODER pron. pl. others: Ω175.
ODERLUKER adv. comp. in a different way, differently, otherwise: Ω158.
OSEN adj. own: Ω113, Ω170.

PENI noun penny: Ω68, Ω311.
PINE noun torture, pain: Ω140.

PRUDE adj. pl. proud: 289.
PUNDE noun pound: Ω68, Ω311.

QUENCHE verb inf. quench: Ω159.
QUEME (IQUEME) verb inf. please, placate (god): Ω98.
QUEMD (IQUEMD) verb pp.

pleased (god): Ω181. QUEMDE (IQUEMDE) verb pa. 3rd pl. pleased: Ω284.
QUIKE adj. pl. quick, living: Ω80, QUICA: Ω199.

RADE noun counsel, advice, wisdom, learning, intelligence, sense, reason: Ω4, Ω92.
RAKETEIE noun pl. chains, fetters: Ω294.

RAUING verb (verbal noun) robbing, plundering, pillaging: Ω266.
RECHE verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg. care, heed, but also recite, tell, say and unfold the meaning of, explain, interpret: Ω140.
REWEN verb inf. rue: Ω22; Ω358.
REUEN noun pl. reeves.
RICHE noun dominion, kingdom: Ω370.
RIPEN verb inf. reap: Ω23.
RIHTWINESSE noun righteousness: Ω73.
RIXLE ð noun reigns (of God who rules over heaven - spiritual): Ω412.
RODE noun cross: Ω196.
RUNE noun utterance, whisper: Ω91.

SA noun sea: Ω85.
SABELINE noun the fur of the sable: Ω377.
SAFTE noun pl. creation, creatures: Ω86.
SADÉ verb pa. 3rd sg. said: Ω136; SADEN verb pa. 3rd pl. said: Ω234.
SAL verb pr. 3rd sg. shall: Ω22.
SAME ð verb pr. 3rd sg. shame: Ω174.
SÆD noun weariness: Ω403.
SCAT noun sheet: Ω378.
SCRENCHÉ verb inf. shrink: Ω347.
SEGGEN verb inf. say: Ω94.
SEED noun weariness: Ω403.
SEELÉ noun fortune, blessing, discretion: Ω16.
SELICH noun wonder: Ω190.
SENCHÉ noun drink: Ω346.
SENNÉ noun sin: Ω134.
SEDEN conj. since: Ω9; Ω122.
SEWEN verb pa. 3rd pl. sown: Ω23.
SIBBE noun relative, kinsman: Ω35.
SIC adj. sick: 208.
SÍKÉR adj. pl. safe, free from danger: Ω:42.
SILDE verb subj. pr. 3rd sg. shield: Ω231;
SILDE verb pr. 3rd pl. shield: Ω361.
SINED verb pr. 3rd sg. shines: Ω290.
SMECHÉ noun smoke: Ω19; SMECHÉ noun smoke: Ω292.
SNÁKEN noun pl. snakes: Ω288.
SOLDE verb pt. 3rd sg. shall: Ω38;
SOLDE(N) verb pt. 2nd sg. shall: Ω48, Ω50.
SÖNE adv. soon: Ω35.
SOP verb pa. 3rd sg. shaped, created: Ω86.

SORE adj. sore, painful, distressing: Ω37;
SORE adv. sorely, bitterly: Ω166.
SORE3E noun sorrow: Ω149, noun pl.
SOT noun A foolish or stupid person, a fool: Ω30.
SOWLE noun soul: Ω143; SOWLE noun soul's: Ω317.
SPEKEN verb inf. to speak: Ω9; SPEKEN verb fst sg. pp, to say in spoken words: Ω9.
SPRUNGE verb pp. pl. sprung: Ω182.
SRUD noun shroud: Ω378.
STEAL noun stealing: Ω266.
STECHÉ noun fragment, piece: Ω198.
STEDE noun place, space, locality: Ω227.
STÍLLE adj. still: Ω117.
STONDE verb pr. 3rd sg. stand: Ω20.
STORRE noun star: Ω290.
STRATE noun street: Ω244, Ω352.
STRENCHE noun strength, force, anger: Ω177.
STUNDE noun a time, a while, a short time: Ω156.
SULLE verb pr. 3rd pl. shall: Ω23.
SUNEGEDEN verb pa. 3rd pl. sinned: Ω271;
SINEGEDEN: Ω297.
SUNNE noun sun: Ω290.
SWARTE adj. dark, black: Ω293.
SWENCHÉ verb inf. afflict, oppress, trouble: Ω263.
SWICHEN noun pl. traitors, deceivers (often used to describe Satan): Ω108;
SWIKEN noun pl. traitors, deceivers: Ω289.
SWIERE noun neck: Ω153.
SWIKELE adj. pl. deceitful, treacherous: Ω264.
SWILCH adj. such: Ω81.
SWINC (ISWINC) noun toil, work: Ω37;
SWINCH : Ω58 (ISWINCH) Ω203;
SWUNCH Ω215; SWINC Ω331; SWUNKE verb pa. 1st pl. worked: Ω332; SWANC verb pa. 3rd sg. worked, toiled: Ω373.

SWINDE verb inf. dwindle away, vanish, disappear: Ω58.
SWINES noun poss. swine's: Ω152.
SWIDE adv. very, much, exceedingly: Ω295.
SWO adv. so: Ω78, Ω70.
SWUNCH see SWINC.
SYRREUE noun sheriff: Ω51.

TACHE verb inf. teach: Ω316, TACHED verb pr. 3rd sg. teach: Ω321.
TAIHTE verb pa. 3rd sg. taught: Ω283.
TEALD verb pp. told: Ω125.
TEMEN verb inf. produce, summon: Ω113.
TERED verb pr. 3rd sg. tear: Ω289.

TIHTE verb pa. 3rd sg. attracted, enticed, allured: Ω283.
TILDE noun labour, work: Ω58.
TIT (ITIT) verb pr. 3rd sg. happens, befalls: Ω130.
TREI3E noun suffering, pain, grief: Ω386.

ÞANC noun thank: Ω72; ÞANKE (IÞANKE) noun thanks, gratitude, will: Ω70.
ÞANC noun thought: Ω254.
ÞARF verb pr. 3rd sg. need: Ω44.
ÞE pron. rel. which: Ω10; who: Ω14 (sometimes preceded by the dem. se or Þe indication of grammatical gender: he who – relative construction)
ÞENCHE verb 1st pl. think: Ω199.
ÞESSES adj. poss. (dem.) this: Ω349.
ÞEIH conj., though, even though: Ω4; though Ω136.

ÞIDER adv. thither, unto that place: Ω47.
ÞESTERNESSE noun darkness: Ω292.
ÞEUE noun thief: Ω44.
ÞRISTE adj. bold: Ω20
ÞO def. art. acc. the: Ω16.
ÞOLIEN verb inf. suffer: Ω191.
ÞUNCH verb inf. seem, appear: Ω63;
ÞINCHED pr. 3 sg. & impers. (it) seems, me – it seems to me, appears to me: Ω5
ÞURCH and ÞURH prep. through: Ω42
ÞUSTER adj. dark: Ω79.

UNBINT verb inf. pr. 3rd sg. unbinds: Ω413.
UNBOHT verb pp. unpaid for: Ω60.
UNBOND verb pa. 3rd sg. unbound, loosened: Ω197.

UNEADE adv. grievous Ω190.
UNFOR3OLDEN verb pp. unrewarded: Ω60
UNFREME noun hurt, misery, loss: Ω237.
UNHALDE noun want of health, weak or poor health: Ω16, Ω338, Ω388; noun pl.: Ω206.
UNHOLDE noun pl. unfaithful, false, hostile: Ω37.
UNILICHE adj. unlike: Ω371.
UNISALDE noun pl. unhappiness, miseries: Ω207, Ω389.
VNET acc. Adj., Useless, unprofitable: Ω5. [OE un-nyt]
UNRIHT noun wickedness, evil: Ω95.
UNHOLDENoun pl. unfaithful, false, hostile: Ω37.
UNILICHENoun pl. unlike: Ω371.
UNISALDENoun pl. unhappiness, miseries: Ω207, Ω389.
VNETAcc. Adj., Useless, unprofitable: Ω5. [OE un-nyt]
UNRIHTNoun wickedness, evil: Ω95.

V

VELE and VEOLE see FELA
VNET, VNNED see UNNET

W

WALLEN noun pl. walls: Ω42
WALLINDE verb (pr. part.) as adj. welling up (boiling): Ω229.
WANE noun misery, woe: Ω160.
WAPNE noun pl. weapons: Ω351.
WARE noun stock, goods (specifically that which God offers: heaven and salvation): Ω69.
WARNIN verb inf. warn: Ω237;
WARNIE verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg. warn: Ω315.
WAS verb AN 1st sg. pret., was: Ω1.
WATERE noun water: Ω84.
WEALDEN verb inf. command, possess: Ω56; WEALDE verb pr. 1st sg., wield, occupy, to have power over, possess: Ω2;
WEALDE noun pr. 3rd sg. rules: Ω402.
WEL adv. very, really: Ω6.
WEIES noun pl. ways: Ω73.
WEIGHEN verb inf. weigh: Ω64.
WELE noun worldly riches: Ω233.
WENDE verb imp. Ω88; WENDE verb sbj. pr. 1st pl. Ω415.
WERENoun man, husband: Ω32.

WERELDES noun poss. world’s: Ω282, Ω378.
WERIEN verb inf. defend, protect, ward off: Ω336; WERIE verb sbj. pr. 1st pl. defend, protect: Ω350.
WERKES noun pl. work: Ω64. WERC noun work: Ω113.
WERSE (A+WERENCE) adj. worse: Ω310.
WERENoun way: Ω14.
WILLED verb pr. 3rd pl. will: Ω100.
WIND noun wind: Ω143.
WINES noun pl. friends: Ω230.
WINTER noun pl. winters, i.e., years: Ω1.
WIT noun, mind, wisdom, understanding: Ω2.
WISSE (IWISSE) noun certainty: Ω41.
WISTE (IWISTE) verb pt. 1st sg. had knowledge, knew: Ω17.
WIDE-PAN cj. with that: Ω161.
WIUE noun wife: Ω25.
WOLDE verb pa. 1st sg. would: Ω17.
WOMBE noun belly: Ω154.
WONING noun (verbal noun) wailing, moaning, lamentation: Ω244.
WOP noun weeping: Ω244.
WORDE noun pl. words: Ω3.
WORELDES noun poss. world’s: Ω233.
WORI adj. dirty, turbid (WORI WATER: well water, dirty water): Ω151.
WOT verb pr. 3rd sg. knows: Ω80.
WRACHE noun vengeance, retribution, punishment: Ω216.
WRECHE adj. pl. wretched: Ω179, Ω272.
WRENCHEN noun pl. deceptions, tricks: Ω264.
WRITE noun writing: Ω101; WRITE (IWRITE) verb pp. written: Ω123, Ω235.
WRONG noun wrong: Ω177.
WRONGWISE adj. unjust, wrongful: Ω49; adj. pl.: Ω269.
WUNDERLUKESTE adj. superl. most wonderful: Ω69.
WUNIEN verb inf. dwell, live, remain, endure, be accustomed to: Ω160, Ω188;
WUNED verb pp.: Ω58; WUNIED verb pr. 3rd sg.: Ω143; WUNINGES noun pl (verbal noun) dwellings: Ω371
Introduction to Diplomatic Editions

Every attempt has been made to avoid editorial interference in the presentation of these transcriptions. The letter-shapes, including the use of capitals, and punctuation are presented, as far as is practicable, as would be found in the manuscripts themselves, with notes added to the commentary that might inform the reader of any further significant features. In addition, word division has not been regularized, as it is in the Copy Text based on T, and accent marks are found in both the text and in the accompanying notes.

The now obsolete letter forms þ (thorn), ð (wyn), ð (eth), æ (ash) ȝ (yogh) or ℮ (insular form), have been retained. It is often customary for editors of Old and Middle English texts to use w for ð, to ease the process of reading the text but, as the aim of these transcriptions is to balance understanding and reading against an accurate representation of the manuscript page, ð has been retained here where it has been replaced with w in the Copy Text based on T. For the purpose of this section of the study it is essential to acknowledge where ð is used and where w; the transition to w itself being an important marker. Similarly, this section of the study differentiates between g, the insular form ℮ and its descendent ȝ. Manuscript i/j and u/v are retained.

Each line of script is given a separate line in the transcription and, as far as it has been possible to do so, the page layout has been reproduced to represent the writing grid. For instance, the text of Lambeth has been written out as it is in the manuscript (as if prose), where, in the Parallel Text Edition, when comparison is essential and this layout is not conducive to the overall purpose, it has been edited so that it matches the rhyming couplets of the other manuscript versions. The mise-en-page of each transcription does reflect that of the manuscript itself; the most obvious examples of this being L and D, where L is written as prose and D is
written as half-lines. However, after some consideration of what is accepted by the modern scholarly reader, and what is standard in such editions, I felt that it was unnecessary to give each new *recto* and *verso* a new page as I had initially intended. Therefore, the *folio* and line numbering, present throughout, are my own and are added as an aid to the reader.

Abbreviations are normally silently expanded, except for *7* (Tironian ‘*et*’) for English *and*. However, the treatment of abbreviations specific to each manuscript is discussed within the introduction to the individual transcription. Later glosses to the texts will not be dealt with in the text but will be noted in the commentary. Rubrication is indicated in the text by a bold font, but does not usually receive separate attention in the apparatus; illumination, similarly, is represented in the text, where possible, and more often also receives commentary in the apparatus – especially in instances where the transcription cannot adequately represent the manuscript. Interlineations are shown within the text (through the use of \_/\) and further elucidation can also be found within the apparatus. Scribal emendation/self correction of the manuscripts is accepted and described more fully in the apparatus.

In addition, the conventions used previously in the text of T as Copy Text, which are taken from EETS, are retained (see p.) unless stated above. The necessary differences in convention and representation between the editions of the *Conduct of Life* (the edition of T as Copy Text; the Diplomatic Editions; and the Parallel Text Edition) are intended to focus the reader on, and highlight, different aspects of the *Conduct of Life*, and different scholarly ways in which to approach the text; this has been discussed in detail in the Introduction (p.).
Transcription of Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52, folios 2r-9v


Line 399 has the punctus elevatus at the line end.

A punctus can also be found after: hunger: line 199; burst: line 327; almesse: line 339; and pil: 345.

Capitalization occurs frequently at the beginning of lines with Initial letters for each new line placed inside the margin; these occurrences will be indicated in the text but not in the accompanying notes.

Abbreviations are not frequent and are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below: māi expanded to mæi: line 9; ernīge expanded to erninge: line 64; cīst expanded to crist: lines 79 and 317; iqīme expanded to iqueme: line 95; hī expanded to him: lines 124 and 129; ada expanded to adam: line 175; qīca expanded to quica: line 192; nā expanded to nam: line 209; frā expanded to fram: line 236.
Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

The Language of the Conduct of Life is generally accepted as being of Essex with M. L. Samuels and Betty Hill, however, suggesting a London provenance, possibly ‘influenced by immigration, perhaps from East Anglia.’ Laing (LAEME) places the text in west Essex. The evidence below certainly supports a localization to the South-East Midlands.

The runic letter ‘þ’ (þorn) is written in initial position in all instances in T (§ 2.1): þan, þeih, þincheð etc., except for ðer (§ 3.3). In medial and final position ‘ð’ is usual: cuðe, seðen, þincheð, mislicað etc. (§ 4.1) with very rare ‘þ’: ðoper and ðep (§ 4.1). T writes th in sathanas, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 Remark) and in thurh, lothe and methes (§ 5). The graph ‘ð’ is written in place of ‘ð’ on four occasions (§ 7.1): folged, haued, bed and ileued. The double fricative [ðð] is simplified in seðen (§ 10.1).

The runic letter ‘ƿ’ (wynn) is retained throughout T with limited examples of ‘w’ (§ 11.1 and § 11.2): mowe, owen, wif, were (twice), wiue, drawen (twice), meward, wel and sowle. The Old English ligature ‘æ’ is rarely found (six occasions) in T (§ 12.3): mæi, ægles, ænes, middenærd, læte and sæd. T writes the Tironian nota ‘Þ’ (§ 13.1) with and being written on only two occasions (§ 13.2).

Insular ‘ȝ’ is retained in T alongside Caroline ‘g’ (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as ‘g’ before a consonant (§ 42.1): grameð, grunde, glede etc. and before the OE back-vowels ‘a, o, u’ (§ 42.2): god, gulte, goldes etc. and by levelling in (bi)ginninge (§ 42.3). The fricative /ɣ/ has been labialized and vocalized to /w/ > /w/ <w> (§ 43) in mowe, owe and drawen (§ 43.2) but ‘ȝ’ is retained in all other places including further occurrences of ogen and

---

moge with <ȝ> (§ 43.1). T preserves <ȝ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): giet, geunge, forgiet etc. but writes <i> before /u/ in jung. Initial <ȝ> is retained before i in gief (§ 45.4). T demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in eien, forpreien, iseien and niseien with <ȝ> retained in peigen. The continuation of the OE movement iȝ > i (§ 48) in ani, mani and eadi is further demonstrated in T. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before d (§ 49) in sade and saden but has been vocalized to /i/ in isaid (§ 49.1). Late OE /dj/, written <ȝ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in bugge and seggen and <g> in abugẽ, ligẽ and legẽ (§ 50). The OE group ñʒ /ŋ/ is written <ng> (§ 51 and § 51.1): longe, kinge, strengeõ, prongpise etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/ before <ð> in strençe (§ 51.2) and to /ŋ/ before <p> in pronpise (§ 51.3).

In initial position /k/ is normally written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in king(e)/kinges, kedde, kenne(s) etc. but it is <œ> in cuðen. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is always <œ> in cunin, care, cunne(n) etc. Before <n> (§ 18) it is <œ> in cnoweð and (i)cñopen and before other consonants (§ 19) it is always <œ> in (i)cleped, (bi)clepien, cliue, criste etc. T writes <qu> (§ 20) for OE cw in iqueme, quike, quenche etc. T writes <k> in medial position for OE velar c throughout the text: (§ 21 and § 21.1): spoken, perke, likede etc. with rare occurrences of <œ> (§ 22 and § 22.1) found in: mislicað, bispicað, brecð, quica and godcunnessë (as a result of the compound god + cunnessë) and one example of <ch> (§ 25 and § 25.2) in spichen. However, <œ> is always retained in final position (§ 23 and § 23.1): ac, þancþonc, loc/lac etc. with no evidence of <k>.

The regular form of /tf/ in T is <ch> (§ 27, § 28.1, § 29.1 and § 30.1): child(e), chilce, muchel(e), smeche, ech/elch, (i)spinç etc and in þunc(s) (§ 32 and § 32.1) and þenchen (§ 32 and § 32.2) etc. with <œ> /tf/ (§ 31 and § 31.1) written twice only in ic; the occasional writing of <œ> in afric and (i)spinç are possible variants with /k/ (§ 31.1). T also writes <k>, probable /k/,
in ofşinkeð and mukel where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at §32, §. 32.3, §. 33 and §. 33.1).

T nearly always writes s (§. 36.1) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: sal, syrreue, sop etc., however, sc (§. 35.1) is written in scrench and scat. In medial position /ʃ/ is ss in fisses (§. 38). OE [ts] is usually written c in milce but is ch on one occasion in milche (§. 41).

T always writes OE unvoiced [f] as f in initial position in fele, fol, fed etc., in final position in lif, of, self (§. 58.2) etc. and in medial position where it is adjacent to one unvoiced sound: ofte, after, lofte (§. 58.3) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§. 58 and §. 58.3) through the writing of v/u between vowels or other voiced sounds in juel, aliue, piue etc. with some instances of f still retained: him-selfen, biforen, afric etc. The writing of f has disappeared before d in hadde (§58.4).

In T OE a in open syllables is always a (§. 59): habben, fare, naucð etc. and a before a nasal (§. 60 and §. 60.1) in man, þanc, þanne etc. Before a lengthening group, OE a is mostly o (§. 61 and §. 61.1): lange, pronge, honden etc. but a in hangeð. In T OE æ shows retraction to a, an expected feature of an EML text, in most examples (§. 63 and §. 63.1): habbe, after, patere/pater etc. with one instance of æ in seed and e in hpeðer. OE e is always e in T (§. 64 and §. 64.4): beren, ende, felde, strence/strengðe etc. the writing of æ in angles and a in angles is probably influenced by OF anglene, angle. OE o is nearly always written as o in T (§. 65.1 and §. 65.3): bifore/biforen, bode, nolde etc. with a written once in sarege. OE i is mostly i (§. 66ff and §. 66.5) in bidden, child, finde(n) etc. with occasional u in pulle, ofsprung and spunche (see §. 66.4 for the influence of w) and e in ofspren, beše, þesse, þesses, nele, nelle, nelled and nesten (§. 66.5, §. 66.6 and §. 66.3 for neutralizing to ð). For OE y, T has a mixture of u and e, a possible indicator of the SEML dialect, writings (§. 67ff and §. 67.5): dude, punche,
gulteð etc. with deden, euel, senne etc. with occasional <i> in þincheð, ðinkeð, king(es), hþilc and before h in drihtë(n) and tihte. OE y (§ 67 and § 67.6) is <i> in litel/litle and hþi; <u> in hudden, fur(e) and cuðen; <e> in here and kedde. T retains <u> for OE u (§ 68 and § 68.1) throughout the text: cume(n), punien, grunde etc.

T writes <o> for OE a, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.4): lore, one, non etc. with rare <a> found in aqerne, bihat (cont.), hatere and hat (cont.). In T OE æ₂ is mostly written as <a>, a feature of the SEML (§ 71, § 73 and § 76): dade, rade, ofdrade etc. and <æ> in lete, with <e> written in iselðe, unsele and mere (for OE ðæer see § 77ff). OE æ₂ is nearly always written as <a> (§ 72ff, § 73 and § 80.1): mast, ar/are, unhalðe etc. with <æ> written in ænes, <ea> in hease and rare examples of <e> in mene and hete (for ælc, elc and ylc see § 81ff). OE ē is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.1): he, dep/deð, iqueme etc (the writing of doð is by analogy, see § 82.1). OE ē is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.3): mine, priste, hþile etc. OE œ is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.1): to, dome, boc etc. (the writing of cam is by analogy, see § 84.1). OE ù is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): nu, ure, þu etc.

In T OE ea (§ 86 and § 87ff) before r, without lengthening, is <a> (§ 88.1 and § 88.2): arge, þarf, arme etc.; before rd (§ 88.2) it is <a> in harde, hardne and hardde with <æ> (§ 87.4) retained in (midden)aerd and <ea> (§ 87.5) in (midden)aerd; before rm (§ 88.4) <a> is written in parnin and parnie with <e> found in erninge. The ð-umlaut of ea before ð-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <œ> (§ 89.4) in derne and erming but <ie>, a likely SEM form, in smierte (§ 89.4 and § 89.2). OE ea before l, without lengthening (Anglian a), is always <æ> (§ 90ff and § 90.4): al and alle, falle, pallen etc.; before ld it is mostly written <ea> (§ 91.3), a form retained in East Saxon (see § 91.2): pealde, eald(e), feald(e), with <œ> in bihelden, <œ> in holde (see § 91.1) and <æ> in halt. For the ð-umlaut of ea before l combinations (Angl. mutation of a) T has <œ> in elder and elde (§ 92ff and § 92.4). OE ea before h combinations is
written with the front glide <ei> (§ 87.3, § 93.2 and § 93.3) in heie and iseih. The i-umlaut of ea before h-combinations is always <i> in mihte(n) and nihte (§ 94.1 and § 94.2).

For OE eo before i-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.3) T writes mostly smoothed <e> in perke/perc, perkes and herte with <ie> in hierte and <o> in storre. The wur group (§ 97 and § 97.3) is <u> in purðe and purðen but for the i-umlaut of eo it is <e> in perest and pers(e). OE eo before l-combinations is <e> (EML § 98ff and §98.4) in self and selfe(n). OE eo before ht is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.2) in unrihtpinesse, unriht, rihte and briht(e) and <i> for the i-umlaut (§ 100ff and § 100.4) in ouer-sihð and þurh-sihð. OE – WS eom is am (chiefly Angl. eam § 101). OE eo (a-umlaut of e) is always <e> in T (§ 102ff and § 103.1): fele, brekeð, pele and unfremu. OE eo (u-umlaut of e) is almost always <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.1) in heuen(e), heueriche, pereld(es) etc. with <u> written under the influence of w in suster and pude. The velar umlaut io of i (§105ff) is mostly <e> in T (§ 105.4): sæðen, seue, bineden etc with <i> in (be)nime, quike/quica, silver and niðer.

In T OE ëa (§ 106ff and § 106.3) is regularly written <ea>: eaðe, deaðe, eadi etc. alongside <e> in ec and eðlate and <a> in brade and rauing. The i-umlaut of ëa (§ 107.1 and § 107.2) is always <e> in ileuen, hereð, temen etc. OE ëo (§ 108ff and § 108.3) is a mixture of <e> and <ie> (§ 108.2): be/ben, lef, friend etc alongside bien, lief, friend etc. The i-umlaut of ëo (§ 109 ff) is mainly <ie> (§ 109.4) in friend, fiend, piesternesse etc., with <e> in frend and derlinges and <u>, possibly from WS y (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /o/ from ëo, in þuster.

In T OE ea after sc (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.2) is always <a> in sal, samie, safte etc. For the i-umlaut of ea after c (§ 113.2) T writes <e> (see § 113.1) in chele and bicherd. OE ëa after g (§ 114) is <ie> in gier. For OE ie after g (§ 116.1) T nearly always <ie> (East Saxon § 115.1): forgiet, gielde, giue etc. with <e> written once in geue. Similarly, for OE ie after g T writes <i> in giet (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE ie after sc (§ 118.2) T writes <i> in silde and sildeð. OE eo after g (§ 119.1 and §120.1)
is <eu> in *geunge* and *geunger*, <u> in *jung* and <ieu> in *gieud*. OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.1) is written as either <u> in *sulen/sulle(n)* or <o> in *solde(n)* and *sop*.

OE *æ* + *ʒ* /j/ is nearly always <ai> in *T* (§ 122.1 and § 122.2) in *mai/maiγ* and *dai/daie*, with <ei> written in *seið*. LWS *sæde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and § 123.1) is mostly <a> in *sade(n)* with <ai> once in *issaid*. OE *æj* (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ʒ* /j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.1) is <ai> in *mai* and *grai* with <æi> in *maei* and <ei> in *isieie(n)* and *niseien*. OE *æi2* + *ʒ* /j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.1) is <ei> in *eider* and <ai> in *aiðer*. OE *e* + *ʒ* /j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.2) is <ei> in *eie, eiseliche, pei, peies, peigen*, and *treiges* with <eg> in *peg*. OE *æ* + *ʒ* /j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.1) is <ei> in *forpreien* and *leie*. OE *œ* + *ʒ* /j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.1) is <ei> in *eien* and *raketeie*. OE *a* + *h* (g) (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <oh> in *foh* and *oh*. OE *æ* + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.1) is <ai> in *aihte* and *taihte*. OE *œ* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.2) is always <o> in *unboht, bipoht, brohte* etc. OE *a* + /Y/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.2) is <aγ> in *lage/lages* but the movement to /au/, written <aw> is demonstrated in *drawen*. OE *a* + /Y/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.2) is <oγ> (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in *mogę* and *ogen*, with the movement to /ɔu/, written <ow>, demonstrated in *mowe* and *owen*. OE *a* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.2) is always <o> before *w* (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in *cnopeδ, blopenδ, sople/sowle* etc. OE *œ* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.2) is <e> in *repėn, sepen*; the i-umlaut is <e> in *untrepnesse*. OE *œ* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.2) is <ea> on two occasions in *feape* and <e> once in *fepe*.
Ich am nu elder þan ich þas a pintre 7 a loren.
Ich pealde more þan idude mi pit oh to be more.
To longe ich habbe child iben a porde 7 a daide.
Þæih ibie a pinter eald to jung ich am on rade.
Vnnet líf ich habbe ilad 7 giet me þincðed ilade
Þæ þan ibidenche me þar on pel sore ime adrade.
Mast al ich habbe idon is idelnesse 7 chilce.
Þæl late ich habbe me biþohte bute me god do milce.
Fele idel pord ich habbe ispeken sœden ich speken cuðe.
7 fele þeunge daide idon þe me ofðinked nuðe.
Alto lome ich habbe igult a perke 7 a porde.
Alto muchel ic habbe ispended to litel ileid on horde.
Mast al þat me likede ar nu hit me mislicð.
Þæ muþel folgd his ipil him selfen he bispicað.
Ich mihte habben bet idon hadde ich þo iselðe
Nu ich þolde ac ine mai for elde 7 for unhalðe.
Elde me is bistolen on ar ich hit ipiste
Ne mai ich isien before me for smeche ne for miste.
Arge þe bed to don god to jouel al to þriste
More eie stondeð man of man þan him do of criste.
Þæ pel ne deþ þe hpile he mai pel ofte hit sal him repen.
Þæ almen sulle ripen þat hie ar senp.
Do al to gode þat he mugþ ech þe hpile he bed aliuæ.
Ne lipne noman to muchel to childe ne to piue.

Þæ þe him selfe forgiæt for pive oðer for childe
He sal cumen on euel stede bute him god be milde.
Sende god biforen him man þe hpile he mai to heuene
For betre is on almesse biforen þan ben after seuene.
Ne bie þe leure þan þe self ne þi mae ne þi mowe
Sot is þe is oðer mannes fremd betere þan his owen.
Ne hopie wif to hire were ne were to his wiue
Be for him self afric man þe hpile he bed aliuæ.
Þis þe him selue bidenche þe hpile he mot libben
For sone pilled him forgiete þe fremde 7 þe sibbe.
Þæ pel ne dod þe hpile he mai ne sal he þan he þolde.
For mani mannes sore ispinc habðed ofte unholde.
Ne solde noman don a furst ne laten pel to done.
For mani man bih’oteþ þat hi forgiæted sone.
Þæ man þe pile sitær ben to habben godes blisse.
Do pel him self þe hpile he mai þanne haudeð hes mid ipisse.

1 Ich] initial letter I is rubricated and enlarged to 22mm so that its tale runs four lines down the margin 4 jung] the j is long i dopped 14 muþel] muþel (scribal error? see Lines 24, 60, 62 etc... where it is muchel) 19 juel] the j is long i dopped 31 ne] prec. by ne (ditt.) eras. 35 mot] dac. above the o: mot 38 bihotæ] a subp. with o int.
f. 3'

De riche men peñed siker ben þu’r’ch pullen 7 thurh dichen.
He deð his aihte an siker stede þe hit sent to heueriche.
For þar[ ] i’ he’ ben ofdrad of fure ne of þieue.
Þar ne mai hit him binime þe loðe ne þe lieue.
Par ne þarf he habben care of here ne of sǐelde
Þider pe sendeð 7 ec beroð to litel 7 to selde.
Þider ’pe solden’ drawen 7 don pel ofte 7 ilome.
For þar ne sal me us naht binime mid prongprise dome.

f. 3"

Litel loc is gode lef þe cumèd of gode pille
7 edlate muchel þieue þan his herte is ille.
Heuene 7 erðe he ouer sihð his eien bedful brihte.
Nis him no þing forholen spo muchel is his mihte.
Ne bie hit no spo derne idon ne on spo þuster nihte.
He pot ṣpot þenched 7 ṣpot doð alle quike pihte

41 þurch] r. sub.
42 aihte[ ] underlined with gode int. (later hand: possibly 16th-century; responsible for three English glosses in the Conduct of Life and more in the homilies) 43 þar[ ] i and he int.; this is only a partial correction as the text should read: For þar ne þarf he ben ofdrad 47 pe solden int. in the same hand 53 for to] to int. ore underlined by glossing hand and favoer, grace added to the right-hand margin 55 holde] a subp. with o int. 64 lean] underlined by glossing hand and dezervinge added to the right-hand margin 68 Africh] underlined but not glossed 70 manke] underlined and glossed manke, mancus; this is not the same hand as the older glosses (previously noted) 73 loc] diacrit. above the o; loc 77 ne[ ] wear, possibly from folding, has made the n difficult to read
Nis louerd spilch is crist ne king spilch ure drihte  
Boðe giemêd þe his bien bi daie 7 bi nihte.  
Heuene 7 erde 7 al þat is biloken is in his honden  
He doð al þat his pill is aþatere 7 alonde.  
He maked þe fisses in þe sa þe fueles on þe lofte.  
He pit 7 pealdêd alle þing 7 he sop alle safte.  
He is ord abuten ord 7 ende abuten ende  
He is one afre on eche stede þar þu pende.  
He is buuen us bien biforen bifore  
Þe godes þille doð aþehpare he maig him finde.  
Elche rune he hered 7 he pot alle dade  
He þurh siðo elches mannes þanc þi hapat sal us to rade.  
Þe þe brekêd godes has 7 gultêd spo ilome  
Hpat sulle þe seggen oþer don ate muchele dome  
Þe þe luueden unriht 7 euel liif ladden  
Hpat sulle þe seggen oþer don þar ængles bedo ofdradde  
Hpat sulle þe beren us biforen mid þpan sulle þe iqueme  
Þe þe nafre god ne duden þan heuenliche deme.

Þar sulle ben deflen spo fele þat þilleð us forpréien.  
Nabbeð hie no þing forgieten of þat hie her iseien.  
Al þat hie iseien her hie þilleð cudên þare  
Bute þe haben hit ibet þe þpile þe here þaren.  
Al þie habbeð on here þrite þat þe misduden here.  
þeih þe hes ne niseien hie þaren ure iferen.  
Hpat sullen horlinges don þe spichen 7 þe forsþorene  
Þi spo felebeð icleped spo þe þe þed icorene  
Þi hþi þaren hie þigiete to þhan þaren hie iborene.  
Þe sulle ben to deade idemd 7 afremo forlorene.  
Elch man `sal` þar biclepien him zelfen 7 ec demen.  
Hic oþen þerc 7 his þanc to þitnesse he sal temen.  
Ne mai him noman alþe þellen demen ne alþe rhite  
For non ne cnoþed hine alþe þel buten one drihte.  
Man þot him self best his perkes 7 his þille.  
Se þe last þot he seid ofte must se þit al þot is stille  
Nis no þitnesse alþe muchel se mannes oþen hierte  
Hþo se seid þat hie bedo hol him self þot his smierte.  
Elch man sal him zelfen demen to deade oþer to liue.  
Þe þitnesse of his oþen þerc to oþer þan hine sal driue.  
Aþ þat afri man haued idon seðen he cam to manne  
Spo he hit iseie abôc iþrite he sal hit þenche þanne.  
Ac drihte ne demeð noman after his biginninge  
Ac al his liif sal ben teald after his endinge.

81 biloken [wear, possibly from folding, has made the word, especially the letters il, very difficult to read]  
92 don [foll. by eras. of two or three words]  
94 Hþat [H partially destroyed by cropping: still legible]  
95 Hþat [H partially destroyed by cropping: still legible]  
96 þi [þi partially destroyed by cropping: still legible]  
107 `sal` [int.]  
108 Hic [mistake for His?  
118 abôc [diacrit above o]
f. 4v

Gief þe endinge is god. 7 euel gief euel is þe ende.
God gieue þat ure ende be god 7 gieue þat he us lende.
Se man þe nafre nele don god ne nafre god lif lade.
Are deað 7 dom cumed ðo his dure he maie þim sore adrade
Pat he ne muge þanne bidden ore for þat itit ilome.
For þi he þis þe bit 7 bigiet 7 bet bifoþe dome.
Þanne þe deað is ate dure þel late he bideð ðore.
Þel late he lateð euel perc þan he hit nemai don nomore.
Senne lat þe 7 þu nah him þan þu hit ne miht do no more:
For þi he is sot þe spo abit to habben goddes ore.
Þeih þeore þe hit leued þel for drihte self hit sade.
Elche time sal þe man of þunche his misdade
Oðer raðer oðer later milce he sal imete.
Ac þe þer naueð ibet muchel he haude to bete
Maniman seió hþo reche pine þe sal habben ende
Ne bidde ich no bet bie ich alesed a domesdai of bende.
Litel þot he ’hþat is pine 7 litel he cnoþed
Hþilc hit is þær sople þunieð hþu biter þind þar bloþed.
Hadde he ben þar on oðer tþo bare tiden.
Nolde he for almidde eard þe þridde þar abiden.
Þat habbed isaid þe come þanne þit piste mid ipisse.
Þo purde sorege seue gier for seuenihte blisse.
7 ure blisse þe ende haude for ende lease pine
Betere is þori pater þan atter imengd mid pene.
Spines brade is pel spat spo is of pilde diere.
Ac al to diere he hit abuið þe giefð þar for his spiere.
Ful þombe mai lihtliche spoken of hunger 7 of fasten
Spo mai of pine þe not hþat is pine þe sal ilasten.

f. 5v

Hadde [he] fonde sume stunde he polde seggen oðer
Eðlate him pare þi 7 child sustoer 7 fader 7 broðer.
Al he polde oðerluker dor 7 oðerluker þenche
Þan he bidode þe helle fur þat no piht ne mai quenche.
Afre he polde her in þo 7 in pane punien
Þið þan he mihte helle fur biflen 7 bisunien.
Eðlate him pare al þele 7 erðeliche blisse
For to þe muckele blisse come þis murie mid ipisse.
Ich pulle nu cumen eft to þe dome þe ich eop ar of sade.
On þe daie 7 ou þe dome us helpe crist 7 rade.
Þar þe mugen ben sore offerd 7 harde us ofdrade.
Þar elch sal al isien him biforen his pord 7 ec his dade.
Al sal þar ben þanne cuð þat men luþen her 7 halen.
Al sal þar ben þanne unþrien þat men her hudden 7 stale.
Þe sullen alre manne líf ícnopen alse ure œgen
Þar sullen efninges ben to þe heie 7 to þe loge.
Ne sal þeih no man samie þiar ne þarf he him adrade.
Geif him her ofþincheð his gult 7 bet his misdade.
For hem ne sameð ne ne grameð þe sulle ben iborege
Ac þoðre habbed same 7 grame 7 òðer fele sorege.
þe dom [s]al ben sone idon ne last hit no piht longe
Ne sal him noman mene þar of strencðe ne of pronge
þo sulle habben hardne dom þe here þaren hardde
þo þe euel hielden preche men 7 euel læge arerde.
Elch after þat he haueð idon sal þar ben þanne idemð
Blide mai he þanne ben þe god haueð pel iquemd.
Alle þo þe sprunge bed of adam 7 of eue
 Alle hie sulle þider cume for sode þe hit íleued.

f. 5v

Þo þe habbed þel idon after here mihte
To heueriche hie sulle fare forð mid ure drihte.
Þo þe deueles perkes habod þidon þar inne þed ifunde
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem in to helle grunde.
Par hie sulle punien abuten ore 7 ende.
Brecð nafre eft crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellich þeih hem be þo 7 þeih hem be uneaðe
Ne sal nafre eft crist þolien dead for lesen hem of deade.
Ænes drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte
Him self he þolede dead for hem þel diere he hes bohte.
Nolde hit moðe don for mai ne suster broðer
Nolde sune don for fader ne no man for òðer.
Vre alre louerd for his þralles ipined he pas a rode
Ure bendes he unbond 7 bohte us mid his blode.
þe gieueð uneaðe for his luue a steche of ure breade
Ne þenche þe naht þar þat sal deme þa quica 7 þe deade.
Muchel luue he us kedde polde þe hit understonde.
Pat ure elderne mi’s d’un þe habod euel an honde.
Dead cam þis middenærd þurh ealde deueles onde
7 senne 7 sorege 7 ispinche a patere 7 londe.
Vre foremes faderes gult þe abugeð alle
Al his ofsprung after him in harem is buaille
Þurst 7 hungur. chele 7 het 7 allunhalðe.
þurh dead cam in þis middenærd 7 òðer unisalðe.
Nare noman elles dead ne sic ne unsele
Ac mihte libbe afremo ablis in hale.
f. 6'

Litel lac is gode lief þe cumeð of gode pille
7 eðlate muchel ȝieue þan his herte is ille
Litel hit þuncheð maniman ac muchel pas þe senne
For hþan alle þolied dead þe comen of here kenne
Here senne 7 ec ure ȝegen us myȝe sore of þunche
For senne pe libeð alle her in soreȝe 7 in spunche.
Seðen god nam spo mukel þrache for one misdede
Þe þe spo ofte misdoð pe myȝen us eade ofdrade.
Adam 7 al his ofspreng for one bare senne.
Þas fele hundred pintre an helle a pine 7 unpenne.
Þo þe ladeð here lif mid unrihte 7 mid pronge
Bute hit godes milce do hie sulle punie þar lange.
Godes pisdom is pel mulchel y alse is his mihte
Ac nis his mihte nopiht lasse ac bi ðer ilke pihte.
More he one maig forgſieue þan alle folc gulte cunne
Self deue mihte habben milce ȝief he hit bigunne.
Þeþe godes milche secð ipis he mai hes vinden
Ac helle king is ore leas þið þo þe he mai binden.
Se deð his pille mast he sal habbe perest mede
His baid sal be pallinde pich his bed barnende glede.
Þerse he doð his gode pines þan his fiendes
God silde alle godes friend þið spo euere friende.
Nafre an helle ine cam ne cumen ich þar ne reche
Þeih ich aches poreldes pеле þare mihte feche.
Þeih þiþe pille seggen eop þat pise men us sадen
7 boc hit is prite þar me hit mai rade.

f. 6''

Ic pille seggen hit þo þe hit hem self nesten
7 þарnin hem þið here unfrême ȝieff hie me pilleð hlesten.
Vnderstanded nu to meward eadi men 7 arme
Ich pille tellen eop of helle pine 7 þарnin eop þið harme.
An helle hunger 7 þurst euel tpo iferen.
Þos pine þolied þo þe þare meteniðinges here.
Þar is þoning 7 þop after ache strate
(H)iþe fareð fram hâteto þe þele fram þele to hâte.
(Þ)an hie beð in þe hâte þele hem þuncheð þlisse.
(Þ)an hie cumed ðt to þele of hât hie habbeð misse.
(E)þer doð 'hém'þo inoh nabethe none lisse.
(Þ)iten þþedr hém doð þers to nafre non þisse.
(H)iþe þalked aþre 7 sechедер reste ac hie hes ne myȝen imeten.
(F)or þi þe hie nolde þe hþile hie mihten here senne beten.
(H)iþe secþeð reste þar non nis ac hie hies ne myȝen ifinden.

207 myȝe | foll. by repen.canc. by underlining.
213 liþ | foll. by a space but no evidence of eras.
215 iþ | foll. by two or three letters
220 nef | foll. by a letter eras.
225 here | foll. by a letter eras.
230 þe | partially destroyed by crop.: still legible
234 þano | partially destroyed by crop.: still legible
236 (H)iþe | crop. hate [to] chele hate chele
237 (þ)un | crop.
238 (þ)un | crop.
239 (E)þedr | crop. 'hém' int.
240 (Þ)iten | crop.
241 (H)iþe | crop.
242 (þ)or | crop.
243 (H)iþe | crop. secþeð h int.
(A)c palked peri up 7 dun se pater doð mid pinde
(Þ)at bed þo þe paren her an þanc unstedefaste
(7) þo þe gode bihten aihite 7 hit him ilaste.
(7) þo þe god perc bigunnen 7 ful endin hit nolden.
(N)u paren her 7 nu þar 7 nesten hpet he polden
(Þ)ar is pich þat afre paled þar sulle punien inne
(Þ)o þe ladeð here lif on þerre 7 an unpinne.
(Þ)ar is fur þis hundredfeald hatere þan þe ure
(N)e mai hit quenche salt pater ne auene stream ne sture.
(Þ)is is þat fur þat afre barned ne mai no biht quenche.
(Þ)ar inne bed þe þas to lef preche men to spenche.

Þo þe spikele men 7 ful of euel prechen.
7 þo þe mihten euel don 7 lief hit þas to þenchen.
Þe luuuden rauing 7 stale hordom 7 drucken
7 an defles perkes blioðeliche spunken.
Þo þe paren spo lease men þat mes ne mihted leuen
Medgierne domes men 7 þr’ onpise reuen.
Þo þe oðer mannnes þif þas þief her oðen eðlate
7 þo þe sunegeden muchel on drucken 7 on ate.
Þe preche men binomen here aihite 7 leide his on horde.
Þe litel letes of godes bode 7 of godes porde.
7 þe his oðen nolde gieue þar he iseih þe niede
Ne nolde ihere godes men þan he sat at his bide.
Þo þe þas oðer mannnes þing leuere þan hit solde.
7 paren alto gradi of silver 7 of golde.
Þo þe untreppes deden þan þe þe solden ben holde.
7 leten al þat hie solden don 7 deden þat hie þolden.
Þo þe paren gjeternes of þis pereldes aihite
7 dude al þat þe loðe gost hem tihte to 7 taihte.
7 al þo’ þe ani pise deuel iquemde
Þo bed mid hem in helle fordon 7 demde.
Bute þo þe ofðuhte sore here misdade
7 Gunnene here gultes bete 7 betere lif lade.
Þar bed þeddon 7 snaken. eueten 7 fruden
Þe tereð 7 freteð þo euele spiken þe niðfule and þe prude
Nafre sunne þar ne sineð ne mone ne storre.
Þar is muchel godes hete 7 muchel godes oerre.

Afre þar is euel smech þiestednesse 7 eie
Nis þar nafre oðer liht þan þe sparte leie.
Þar liged eleliche fiend in stronge raketeie
Þat bed þo þe paren mid god angles spide heie.

244 (A)c crop. 245 (Þ)at crop. 246 (7) crop. 247 (7) crop. 248 (N)u crop. nesten] written mesten with a minim subpunc. 249 (Þ)ar crop. 250 (Þ) crop. 7 fol. by a letter eras. 251 (Þ)ar crop. 252 (N)e crop. 253 (Þ)as crop. 254 (Þ)ar crop. 260 þr’ onpise] int. 261 pas] fol. by two letters eras. 263 men fol. by a letter eras. 273 [Þo] int. 284 heie} h written over another letter

361
That be ateliche fiend 7 eiseliche pihen
Po sulle þe preche sople isien þe singedegen þurh sihte
Par is se lodæ sathanas 7 belzebub se ealde
Eaðe he mujen ben sore ofdrad þe sullen hes bihealde.
Ne mai non herte hit þenche ne tunge hit ne mai telle
Hpu muchele pine ne hpu fele senden in helle
Of þo pine þe þar bieð nolle ich eop naht lie
Nis hit bute gamen 7 glie of þat man mai here drie.
7 ȝiet ne doð hem naht alse po in þe lodæ bende
Spo þat he piten þat here pine sal nafre habben ende
Par bëd þe hadene men þe þaren lage lease
Þe nes naht of godes bode n e of godes hease.
Euele cristene men hie bëd here iferen
Po þe here crístendom euele hielden here.
7 ȝiet he bëd aperse stede anider helle grunde
Ne sullen nafre cumen ut for peni ne for punde.
Ne mai hem nodær helpe þar ibede ne almesse
For naht solden bidde þar ore ne forgíeuenesse.
Silde him elch man þe þhile he mai pið þos helle pine.
(?) parne his frend þar pið spo ich habbe ido mine.
(l) þe þilde hem ne cumen ich hem pille tache
(l) ich can ben aider ȝief isal lichame 7 sople lache.

Late þe þat god forbet alle mankenne
7 do þe þat he us hat 7 silde þe us pid senne.
Luue þe god mid ure herte 7 mid al ure mihite
7 ure emcristen alse us self spo us tached drihte.
Al þat me rade Þ singed before godes borde
Al hit hangeð 7 hält bi þese þam porde
Alle gode[s] lages hie fullèd þe nepe 7 þe ealde
Peþe þos tpo luues halt 7 pille hes pel healde.
Ac hiie bieð þel arefeð heald spo ofte þe gul’t’eð alle
For hit is strong te stonde longe 7 liht hit is to falle.
Ac drihte crist geue us streng’d stonde þat þe moten
7 of alle ure gultes ȝieue us cume bote.
Pe pilnieð after pereldes þele þe longe ne mai ilaste
7 leged mast al ure spinc on þing unstedefast.
Spunke for godes luue half þat þe doð for eihite.
Nare þe naht spo ofte biherd ne spo eucle bikeihte
ȝief þe serueden god half þat þe þoð for erminges
Pe mihten habben more an heuene þa ȝierles 7 kinges
Ne muȝe þe þerien nader ne pið þurst ne pið hunger

Ne pid elde ne pið dead þe elder ne þe þeunger
Ac þar nis hunger ne þurst. dead ne unhalde ne elde.
Of þesse riche þe þenchede to ofte of þare alto selde.  
þe solden biþchenen us pel ofte 7 ilom[e]  
Hpat pe beð to hpan pe sullen 7 of hpan pe come.  
Hpu little hpile pe bieð her hpu longe elles hpake  
Hpat pe muþen habben her 7 hpat pe findeð þare.

Gief paren pise men þus þe solden þenchen  
Bute þe purðen us ipar þis pereld us pile drenchen  
Mast alle men hit þieueð drinken of on eule senche  
(He) sal him cunnen sidle wel gief hit him nele screnche.
Mid al mihtin godes luue ute þe us biperien  
(Þ)ið þesses preches poreldes luue þat hit ne muþe us derien.  
Mid almesse. mid fasten 7 mid ibeden perie þe us pid senne.
Mid þo papne þe god haued þieue alle man kenne.  
(L)ate þe þe brode strate 7 þane þeg bene  
þe lat þe nieðe dal to helle of manne me mai pene.
(G)þo þe þane narepe þad 7 þene þei grene  
(þ)ar ford fareð þel litel folc 7 eche is fair 7 isene
(þ)e brode strate is ure pil. þe is loð þe læte  
(þ)o þe folgeð here ipil þie fareð þi þare strate.
(He) þe muþen lihtliche cumen þid þare niðer helde  
(Þ)urh one godelease pude to one bare felde  
(þ)a narepe þad is godes has. þar ford fareð þel feape
(þ)at þed þo þe hem silded þierno þið achen unðeape.
(þ)os godð unëade ægien þe cliue 7 ægien þe heie hulle
(þ)os leten al here ipil for godes luue to fulle.
(þ)o þe alle þane þei for he us pile bringe
Mid þo feape faire men biforn þe heuen kinge
(þ)ar is ære blissen mast mid angles songe.  
(þ)e is a þusend pinte þar ne þuncheð hit him naht longe.

þe last haued bliss þe haued ssopo muchel þat he ne bit no more  
þe þat blissen forgoð hit sal him repon sore.
Ne mai non euel ne non þane ben in godes riche
Peih þar ben puniinges fele elch oðer unliçhe  
Sume þar habbeð lasse blissen 7sume þar habbeð more
Elch after þat he dude her after þane þe spanç sore

Ne sal þar ben bread ne pin ne ðoder kennes este
God one sal ben achen lif 7 blisse 7 achen reste.
Ne sal þar ben foh ne grai ne cunin ne ermine
Ne aquerne ne metheschele ne beuer ne sableine.
Ne sal þar ben naðer scat ne srud ne pereldes þele none.
Al þe blisse þe me us bihat al hit sal ben god one
Ne mai no blisse ben alse muchel se is godes sihte.
He is soð sunne 7 briht 7 dai abute nihte.
He is aches godes ful nis him no piht uten.
Nones godes hem nis þane þe þunieð him abuten.
Þar is þele abuten þane 7 reste abuten spunch.
Þe muȝen 7 nelled þider cume hit hem mai ofþunche.
Þar is blisse abuten treige 7 lif abuten deade
Þo þe afre sulle þunie þar blide hie muȝe ben eade.
þar is þieude abuten elde 7 hale abuten unhalde
Nis þar særeþe ne sor non ne nafre unisalde.
þar me drihte self isien spo se is mid ipisse
He one mai 7 sal al ben angles 7 manne blisse.

7 þeih ne bed here eien naht alle iliche brihte
Hi nabetþo nahte iliche muchel alle of godes lihte
On þesse liue he naren naht alle of ore mihte
Ne þar ne sullen habben god. alle bi one pihte.
Þo sullen more of him isien þe luueden hine more
7 more icnopen 7 ec piten his mihte 7 his ore
On him hie sulle vinden al þat man mai to bleste
(On) him he sullen ec isien al þat hie ar nesten.
(C)rist sal one bien inogþ all his derlinges.
(Þ)e one is muche more 7 betere þan alle ðoder þinges.
(Þ)oh he haueþ þe hine haueþ þe alle þinges pealdeþ.
(Ó)f him to isiene nis non sæþ spo fair he is to bihelden
(G)od is spo mere 7 spo muchel in his godcunnnesse
(Þ)at al þat elles þas 7 is is fele þerse 7 lasse.
(Þ)e mai hit nafre noman ðoder seggen mid ipisse
(Þ)pu muchele muirðe habbeþ þo þe þed in godes blisse
(Þ)ore þare blisse us þrigge god þe rixleþ abuten ende.
(Þ)ane he ure sowle unbint of lichamliche bende
(C)rist þiueþ us laden her spilch lif 7 habben her spilch ende;
(Þ)at þe moten þider cumen þane þe henne pende.
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MS Pointing: The text of L is more heavily punctuated than any of the other versions of the Conduct of Life. This is because the verse-sermon has been written out as prose, in order to maximise the writing space, and, therefore, necessitates such divisions that might normally, in the other versions of the text, be made apparent through the mise-en-page. The original line division has been reproduced here in an attempt to provide a better understanding of its original context, whereas, it has been changed elsewhere in this edition (pp. ) for ease of reading. The scribe of L uses both punctus and punctus elevatus. These occurrences are represented in the following transcription (pp. ) but will not be pointed out in these notes.

Capitalization is sporadic; usually occurring, but not always, after a punctus. Capitalization will be indicated in the text but not in the accompanying notes.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

Throughout the text þ has been expanded to þet at lines: 7, 11, 22 \((x2)\), 23, 28, 33, 36, 45, 58, 59 \((x2)\), 67, 76, 79 \((x2)\), 84, 92, 93, 102, 109, 110, 111, 112, 117, 127, 135, 136, 137 \((x2)\), 140 \((x2)\), 144, 148, 156\(^2\), 171, 173, 175, 181, 194, 214, 216, 250, 268, 277, 279, 280, 287, 289, 292, 295, 299\(^2\) and 301. There are only four occasions where þet is written out, and they are at lines: 63, 130, 156\(^1\) and 299\(^1\).

iqv\(e\)ðen expanded to iqueðen: line 10; c\(v\)ste expanded to criste: lines 20, 91, 176 and 205; eft expanded to efter: lines 29, 75, 133 and 259; bet\(e\) expanded to betre: line 34; \(\overline{M}\). expanded to Mon: lines 36, 44, 119, 121, 123, 128, 130, 133, 137 and 146; \(\overline{M}\). expanded to Men: line 44; þene expanded to þenne: line 71; þuchen expanded to þuchen: line 73; sune expanded to sunne: lines 86/87, 225 and 228; q\(v\)ke expanded to quike: lines 90 and 214; laud expanded to laured: lines 91.
and 201; scule expanded to sculen: lines 117 and 201; bideme expanded to bidemen: line 119; monne expanded to monne: line 131; sume expanded to summe: line 162; þenche expanded to þenchen: line 168; adrede expanded to adreden: line 177; me expanded to men: line 179; þane expanded to þanne: line 180; euenigges expanded to euenigges: line 183; frod expanded to frond: line 206; sust expanded to suster: line 209; undesde expanded to understonde: line 215; pate expanded to pater(e): lines 218 and 270; þuched expanded to þunched: line 224/225; sprung expanded to sprung: line 232; habbe expanded to habben: line 240; ifiden expanded to ifinden: line 242; bernide is expanded to berninde: line 245; vnstonde expanded to vnstonde: line 254/255; quenchen expanded to quenchen: line 278; quechen expanded to quenchen: line 280/281; ho expanded to hom: line 287; prongis expanded to prongise: line 288; mones expanded to monnes: lines 289 and 295.

Rubrication is regularly employed throughout this text, including the opening pair of couplets and individual words and phrases later in the text. These are indicated through a bold font in the transcription.

The scribe regularly uses an oblique stroke between the two parts of the same word when split across lines. Instances of this are indicated in the text by the symbol ‘ ’; where it is not present and is warranted, the symbol [-] has been inserted into the text. Neither will be commented on in the notes that follow.

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

It is generally agreed that this text has a WML dialect with some features of the “AB” language, which are evident in the anaylsis that follows, with M. L. Samuels localizing it to the
border of North Herefordshire and Shropshire,\(^{840}\) and Laing (LAEME), due to the close affinities in language it has with that of the Worcester Tremulous Scribe and the other elements in common with the “AB” language, placing it in North West Worcestershire.\(^{841}\)

The runic letter <p> (born) is written in initial position in all instances in L (§ 2.2): þan, þah, þingþ etc., except for ðe (§ 3.3). In medial position L mostly writes ð (eth): iqueðen, sodðen, kuðe etc. (§ 4.2). However, there is also regular writings of <p> (often before final –e) in: iselpe, un-helpe, binopenh etc. (§ 4.2). In final position L also mostly writes ð: misleked, fulied, bispiked etc. with <p> less regularly found: þingþ, depþ, dopþ etc. (§ 4.2). The interchangeability of <p> and ð is demonstrated in bab and bað which appear in the same line (Ω229). L writes þth (§ 5) in sathanas, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 Remark) and in þith and lathed (here it represents <t>: see § 5). In L <p> is written where <h> might normally be expected on one occasion in þurþ; this might be a scribal error for þ or, alternatively, it is possible that this is a genuine variant reading of this word (see § 6.3). The graph <d> is written for ð on three occasions, in: cud, uneade and bernd (§ 7.2) and conversely, ð is mistakenly written for <d> in heð (§ 7.7). There are also rare occurrences of the dental stop /t/ written for ð/þ in low stress positions (§ 8 and § 8.1): þinchet, hauet, seit, et lete and þunchet and, on one occasion, assimilation of <p> (§ 8 and § 8.1) in attere.

The runic letter <p> (wynn) is retained throughout L with only one example of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.3) found in swicen. L writes the Tironian nota <t> (§ 13.1) with and being written on only three occasions (§ 13.3).

Insular ð is retained in L alongside Caroline g (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): gromeð, grunde, glede etc. and before the OE back-

\(^{840}\) Hill ‘The Twelfth-Century Conduct of Life’, p.108.
vowels a, o, u (§ 42.2): god, gulte, golde etc. and by levelling in (bi)ginnigge and gate (§ 42.3). The movement to <w> is not present in L, which retains <ᵹ> for the fricative /Ɣ/ (§ 43.4) in mage, aɡen, draɡen etc. and <h> in ahen (§ 43.5) – a feature of the AB dialect. L preserves <ᵹ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): ūŋɡ, ɡet, ūŋge etc. but writes <ɡ> in Giue (see § 45.2 and Comment) Initial <ᵹ> is retained before i in ūɡef/ɡefefiɡif (§ 45.4) but writes <ɡ> in Gif (see Comment to (§ 45.4). L demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in ƿeien and forƿreien with <ᵹ> retained in eɡen, niseɡen and isegen (the writing of <ᵹ> in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement Įɡ > i (§ 48) in eni, moni and edi is further demonstrated in L but <ɡ> is written in anige. Palatal ʒ /j/ is lost before d (§ 49) in sede but is more regularly vocalized to /i/ in seide, iseid and seiden – a probable Anglian feature (§ 49.2). Late OE /dʒ/, written <ɡɡ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in bugge and seggen but <ᵹ> in abugɛd (§ 50). The OE group nʒ /ŋɡ/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.4 and § 51.7): longe, erninge, engles, tening etc. with devoicing to /ŋ/ before <d> in meind (§ 51.5) and omission of <n> in biginigge (§ 51.7).

In initial position /k/ is written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in king and kuðe but it is < >/ in cudde and cunne. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is written < >/ in cunne, cumen/come(n), cum/com etc. but <k> is found in kare, kon, kuðe and kumed. Before <n> (§ 18) it is <k> in knauð and (i)knaupen but before other consonants (§ 19) it is always < >/ in (i)clepede, (bi)clepie, and criste. L writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE cw in iquẽen, quike, quenchen etc. L writes <k> in medial position for OE velar c throughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.2): speke(n), perke, likede etc. with only one occurrence of < >/ (§. 22 and §. 22.2) found in swicen. However, < >/ is retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.2): ponc, lac, perc etc. with no evidence of <k>. L writes <ch> (§ 25 and § 25.2) in both perch and perche as well as in ach. The writing of <ch> in
acha and <h> in ah demonstrate a transition to the fricative /ax/ (§ 26 and § 26.1) – a feature it shares with J and that is associated with the OE Anglian dialect.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in L is <ch> (§ 27, § 28.2, § 29.2 and § 30.2): child(e), chep, muchel(e), eche, ich, spich etc and in bunchen (§ 32 and § 32.5) and penchen (§ 32 and § 32.6) etc. with <c> /tʃ/ (§ 31 and § 31.2) written once in hƿice, however, the occasional writing of <c> in sullic and (i)spinc are possible variants with /k/ (§ 31.2). In addition, L also demonstrates palatalization in the variants þing þ and þingch þ (§ 32.6) where þinc þ (§ 32.1 and § 32.7) is likely to be a variant with /k/ along with þenke and þenkeð (§ 32.1 and § 32.9). L also writes <k> in smike and hƿilke where palatal /tʃ/ might have been expected (§ 33 and § 33.2).

L mostly writes <sc> (§ 35.2) for /ʃ/ (§ 34) in initial position: scal, scop, sceafte etc. with <s> (§ 36.2) written in solde, (bi) sunien and sal and <sch> (§ 37.1) written in schal. In medial position /ʃ/ is <ss> in fisses (§ 38) and in final position <sc> in uersc (§ 39). OE [ts] is always written <c> in milce (§ 41).

L always writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position in ful, (bi) fealt, fole (§ 58 and § 58.5) etc., in final position in lif, of, hine solf (§ 58.6) etc. and in medial position where it is adjacent to one unvoiced sound: oft/ofte, etter, lifte (§ 58.6) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.7) through the writing of <u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in aliue, piue, him-solue etc. with some instances of <f> still retained: bifer(n), ufele/vfel. gefe and efre etc. The writing of <f> remains before d in hefde(n) (§58.8).

In L OE a in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): habbe, faren, babien etc. but before a nasal there is evidence of West Midland /ɔ/, written <o> (§ 60 and § 60.2) in mon, moni, bonke etc. alongside a limited writing of <a> in panke, panne and manke. Before a lengthening group,
OE a is mostly <o> (§ 61 and §61.2): longe, pronge, honde etc. but <a> in prange and prangepise.

L mostly writes WML <e> for OE æ with a mixture of <a> (§ 63 and § 63.2): hefde, efþ, elmesse etc. with habbe/abbe, pater/patere, hpat. fader and bab. OE e is almost always <e> in L (§ 64 and § 64.4): beren, ende, strenge etc. with <ei> in meind. The writing of <u> in sullic is a result of WS syllic. The dominant reading for OE o in L is <o> (§ 65.1 and § 65.4): biforen, borde, nolden etc., however, the writing of <a>, a feature of the AB dialect (§ 65.2), is regularly found in nalde and palde. OE i is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.7) in biden, child/childe, finde(n) etc. with <e> written once only in berde (§ 66.7 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to ê) and occasional <u> in pule, pulle, pulleð (see § 66.4 for the influence of w) and nute and nusten (a probable feature of the AB dialect see § 66.8). For OE y, L has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.7), a feature of WML texts: dude, gulte, muchel etc. with regular writings of <i> also found: bingþ, afirst, king etc. and <e> only twice in dede and (vn)net. OE y (§ 67 and § 67.8) is, once again, mostly <u> in lutel, ihud, fur(e), cuðe and kudde; with <i> written in litel/litle and hpi. L almost always retains <u> for OE u (§ 68 and § 68.2) throughout the text: cume(n), punien, grunde etc except in two instances of come where the transition to <o> is demonstrated.

L writes <a> for OE ā, a feature of the AB dialect, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.5): lare, ane, nan etc. with <o> only present in pori. In L OE æ is written <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): dede, rede, adrede etc. with <a> (§ 75.3) written only once in latheð (for OE þær see § 77ff). OE æ2 is nearly always written as <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) mest, un-helpe, lest etc. with <a> (§ 79.7) only present on one occasion in anige (for ælc, elc and y/lec see § 81ff). OE ȅ is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.2): he, deb/deð, iquemen etc . OE i is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.4): mi, priste, hpile etc. OE ọ is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.2): to, dom(e), boke(n) etc. OE u is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): nu, ure/vre/hure, þu etc.
In L OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r* (§ 88.5) is regularly <e> (§ 88.1 and § 88.5ff), a likely feature of the AB dialect: *erge* and *perf.* with <ə> written in *arme*; before *rd* (§ 88.6) in *(midden)*erd(e), *herde* and *hernde*; before *mm* (§ 88.7) in *erninge* and *permin*, with <a> in *parni.* The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.5) in *derne* but <i>, a likely SWM form, in *smirte* (§ 89.5). OE *ea* before *l* (Anglian *a*), without lengthening, is nearly always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.5): *al* and *alle*, *þæl* etc. with <ea> written once in *bi-fealt* (see § 90.3); before *ld* it is mostly written as <a> (§ 91.1, § 91.2 and § 91.4): *palde*, *ald*, *falde* etc. with <e> written in *ƿalde* (n). For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l*-combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) L has <e> in *elde* and <a> in *ald* (§ 92ff and § 92.5). OE *ea* before *h* combinations is <e> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.4) in *iæch.* The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <i> in *mihte*/*miche* and *nihte* (§ 94.1 and § 94.3: for the writing of <a> in *mahte* see § 94.1 *Comment*).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.4) L writes mostly smoothed <e> in *perke*/*perch, perkes* and *hert* with <o> in *horte.* The *wur* group (§ 97 and § 97.4) is <u> in *purð*, *purde* and for the *i*-umlaut of *eo* it is <u> in *purst* and *purs* (see note to § 97.4). OE *eo* before *l*-combinations is <o> (Angl. § 98ff and §98.5) in *solf*/*solue.* OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.3) in *rihtpinsesse, unriht, rihte* and *bricht(e)* and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100ff and § 100.5) in *ouer-sich* and *purh-scihð.* OE – WS *eom* is *em* (SW form § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is regularly WML <o> (§ 102.3 and § 103.2) in *fele*, *brokeð* and *unfrome* alongside <e> in *fele* and *pele.* OE *eo* (*u*-umlaut of *e*) is regularly WML <o> (§ 102.3 and § 104.2) in *houn(e)* and *porld(es)* alongside <e> in *heuen* with <u> written under the influence of *w* in *suster.* The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) is regularly written as <o> (WML and SW form) in L (§ 105.5): *sodðen, souene, binoppen* etc., with <u> written in *sudden* (from IWS *syðan*, see § 105.3) alongside <e> in *here, iclepede* and *biclepie* and <i> in *(be)nimen* and *quike.*
In L OE ēa (§ 106ff and § 106.4) is mostly <ei>: ec, chep, eðe etc., with <ea> written in uneade and deape (both of these instances of <ea> are found in rhyming position and might reflect a feature of the text being copied). The ñ-umlaut of ēa (§ 107.1 and § 107.3) is always <e> in ileue(n), alesed, iheren etc. OE ëo (§ 108ff and § 108.4) is mostly a mixture of <eo> and <o>, forms associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1): bon/bo, son, frond etc alongside beo, seon, freond etc. with <i> in bid and <e> in sec and tening. The ñ-umlaut of ëo (§ 109 ff) is mainly <o> (§ 109.5), WML and Southern form (§ 109.1 and § 108) in frond, dore, node and þostre, with <e> in þostre.

In L OE ea after sc (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.3) is <a> in schal/scal and scameþ, with <e> in sceft and <o> in scome. For the ñ-umlaut of ea after c (§ 113.3) L writes <e> (see § 113.1) in chele. OE ēa after g (§ 114) is <e> in ger. For OE ie after g (§ 116.2) L nearly always writes <e> (Anglian § 115.1): forget, gefe, gelde etc. Similarly, for OE ie after g L writes <e> in get (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE ie after sc (§ 118.3) L writes <i> in scilde. OE eo after g (§ 119.1 and §120.2) is <o> in gung and gunge. OE eo after sc (§ 121.2) is written as either <u> in sculen/scule and sculden or <o> in solde and sop.

OE æ + þ/j/ is nearly always <ei> (WM § 122.1) in L (§ 122.3) in mei, seið/seit, bideþ and dei, with <ai> written on rare occasions in mai. LWS sæðe / Anglian segde (§ 123 and §123.2) is mostly <ei> in seide(n) with <e> once in sede. OE æ, (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + þ/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.2) is <ei> in mei, with <e> in isegen and nisegen. OE æ + þ/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.2) is <ei> in eiðer. OE e + þ/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.3) is <ei> in peien with <e> in peges. OE æ + þ/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.2) is <ei> in forpreien. OE ēa + þ/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.2) is <e> in egen. OE æ + h (g) (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <ah> in ahte and <ach> in achten. OE æ + h (§ 134.1 and § 134.3) is always <e> before ch in echte and <a> before ch in tachte. OE ð + h (§ 134.1 and § 134.3) is always <o> in unbocht, bípoht, brohte etc. OE a + /j/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.3) is <a> in lage and dragen. OE æ + /j/
(§ 137.1 and § 137.3) is <a> (a feature of the AB dialect, see § 69) before <g> in mage and agen and before <h> in ahen. OE ā + w (§ 138.1 and § 138.3) is regularly <a> (a feature of the AB dialect, see § 69) before w in mapen and blapeð and in the combination <au> in iknaupen, knað/cnað and saule. OE ēo + w (§ 139.1 and § 139.3) is <o> (WM form cf. § 108.1) before w in ropen, sopen; the ɪ-umlaut is <o> in untropnesse. OE ēa + w (§ 140.1 and § 140.2) is <ea> on two occasions in feape and <e> once in fepe. OE ēa + w (§ 140.1 and § 140.3) is <a> in scapeð.
ich em nu alder þene ich pes apintre 7 a lare. Ich pelde mare þene ich dede mi [pit] ahte bon mare. þel longe ich habbe child ibon a porde 7 a dede þa h' ich bo a pintre ald to gung ich em on rede, Vnet liif ich habbe iled. 7 get me þingb ilede. þenne ich me bi þen' che pel ful sare ich me adrede. mest al þet ich ha[-] bbe idon bi fealt to child hade. pel late ich abbe me bi þocht þ' bute God me nu rede. Fole idel pord ich habbe iqueðen sodden ich speke kude. Fole gun' ge dede idon 'þe me of þinchet nude. Mest al þet me likede er nu 'þ hit me misleked, þa muchel fulið his pil 'hine solf he bispiked. Ich mihte habbe bet idon. hefde ich þe iselþe. Nu ich palde ah ich ne mei 'þ for elde 7 for un helþe. Elde me is bistolen on. er ich hit piste. ne michte ich seon bi fore me. for smike ne for miste. Eirþe þe beoð to done god. 7 to ufele al to þriste. Ma' re eie stondeð men of monne þanne hom do of criste. þe þel ne doð þe hpile þe ho magen. pel oft hit schal ropen 'þenne ge mapen sculen 7 repen þet ho er sopen. Do he to gode þet he nu' þe hpile þet he bo aliue. ne lipnie na mon to muchel to childe ne to piue. þe him solue forget for piue ne for childe 'þe scal cu' men in uuæl stude bute him God bo mii[-] de Sended sum god bi foren eop. þe hpile þet ge mugen to houene. for betere is an el[-] messe bifore. 'þenne boð efter souene. Alto lome ich habbe igult a perke 7 o porde. Alto muchel ich habbe ispent. to litel ihud in horde. Ne beo þe loure þene þe solf. ne þin mei. ne þin magæ. Soht is þet is oder'þ monnes frond betre þen his ægen. Ne lipnie pif to hire pere. ne pere to his piue bo for him solue ech. Mon. þe 'þ'pile þet he bo aliue. pis is þe to him solue bench þe hpile þe [he] mot libben. for sone pule hine forgeten þe fremede 7 þe sibbe. þe þel ne deð þe ðpile he mai 'þ ne scal þenne he palde. Monies monnes sare ispinc habbedo oft un holde. Ne scal na mon don afirst. ne slapen pel
to done. For moni mon bihateð pel þe hit forgeteð sone. De. Mon. þe pule siker bon to habben Godes blisse. do þel him solf hpile þet he mai þ þenne haueð he his mid ipisse. þes riche. Men. peneð bon siker þurh palle 7 þu[‐] rh diche, þe deð his echte on sikere stude he hit sent to heuenriche. For þer ne þerf he bon of dred of fure ne of þoue þer ne

þerf he him binimen þe laðe ne þe loue. þer ne þerf he habben kare of geþe ne of gelde. þider he sent. 7 solf bereð to lutel 7 to selde. þider þe sculen dragen 7 don pel ofte 7 ilome. for þer ne scal me us naut binimen mid prangpise dome. þider ðe sculen gorne dragen. þalde ð god ile’ ue. for ne mei þet hit ou binimen king ne reue. Al þet beste þet þe hefden þider þe hit. solde senden for þer þe hit michte finden eft. 7 habben buten ende. þo þe er doð eni God for habben godes are. al he hit scal fin’ den eft þer 7 hundred fald mare. De þet echte pile halden þel hpile þe he muge es pelden. Guie hies for godes luue þ þenne déþ hes pel ihalden. Vre spinc 7 ure tilbe is ofte iponed to spinden. Ach þet þe þe doð for godes luue ðe þe sculen al finden. Ne scal nan ufel bon unbocht. ne nan god unfor’ golden. vtel þe doþ al to muchel. 7 god lesse þenne þe sculden. Þo þe mest doð nu to gode. 7 þe lest to laðe. Eðer to lutel 7 to muchel scal þunchen eft hom baþe. Þer me scal ure þerkes peien bi foran þe heuen king, and geuen us ure spinkes lan efter ure erninge. 75

Ech mon mid þet he hauet. mei bugen hous[‐] ne riche. þe mare hauþ 7 þe þe lesse ð baþe hi

mugen liche. Alse mid his þey’ nie alse oðer mið his punde. þet is þe punderlukest þep ð þet eni mon efre funde. 7 þe þe mare ne mai don þ do hit mid his gode þonke. Alse pel se þe þe haueð golde fele manke. 7 oft god kon mare þonc þen þe him þeueð lesse. 7 his þerkes 7 his þeges his milce. 7 rihtpisnesse. lu[‐] tel lac is gode lof ð þet kumeð of gode pille. 7 ecle’
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te muchel ȝeue of þan þe herte is ille. Houene 7
horþe he ouer sich. his eingen boð spa brichte. Sun'
ne 7 mone 7 houen fur boð þestre aȝein his lif'
tete. Nis him noht forholen nihud. spa muchele
boð his mihte. nis hit ne spa derne ne spa þostre
nihte. he pat þet ȝenkeð 7 hpet doð alle quike pih'
ten. Nis na lauerd spich se is crist. ne king spuch
ure drihten. Houene 7 orðe 7 al þet is biloken is
in his honde. he deð al þet his pil is ȝa pettre 7
alone. He makede fisses in þe se 7 fuges in
þe lifte. he pit 7 paldæ alle þing 7 scop alle
scefte. he is hord buten horde 7 ende buten en[-]
de. he ane is eure an ilche stude pende þer þu
pende. he is buyen us 7 binoþen. biforen 7 bi[-]
hinden. þe þe deð godes pille uþer he mei him
finden. Helche rune he iherð 7 pat alle deden.
he þurþ sicheþ uches monnes þonc. Pi hpat
scal us to rede. Þe þet brokeð godes hese 7 gultæð
spa ilome. hpet scule pe seggen oðer don et þe
muchele dome. Þa þe luueden unriht 7 ufel lif

loden. Þet sculen ho seggen oðer don ȝeþen
þe engles bon of dred. hpet sculen pe beren
biforen us mid hom scule pe iquemen. þo
þe neure god ne dudu þe houenlíche deme.
þer sculen bon doule spa foþe þet pulde us for
preien. 7 nabbedi naþing forþeten of al þet
ho iſeȝen. Al þet þe misduden her ȝ ho hit pul'
leð kuþe þere. Al ho habbedi in hore prite ȝet þe pe
misduden here. þaþ þe nusten ne niseȝen ȝe
ho peren ure ifere. Hpet sculen ordlinghes
don. þa swicen 7 ta forsporene hpi boð foþe
iclepede. 7 spa lut icorenæ. þi hpi þeren ho
bigenæ to hþon þeren ho iborenæ. þet sculen
bon to deþe idemet. 7 eure ma forlorene.
Ech .Mon. scal him solue þer biclepie 7 bidemen.
his aȝen perch 7 his þonc te pitnesse he scal
demen. ne mei him na .Mon. alþa pel demen
ne alþa rihte for nan ne knauð him aþe
ȝere ȝeþen buten aþe drihte. Ech .Mon. þat him[-]
solue best ȝ his perkes. 7 his pilæ. þe
þe lesst þat biseþ ofte mest ȝe hit al þat is
stille. nis nan pitnesse alþe muchel se monne's
ȝagen horte. pa se sið þet he bo hal. him solf þat
best his smirte. Ech Mon. scal hm solf demen to deðe oðer to liue. þa pitenisse of his ægen perch ʒ hine þer to scal driue. Al þet ech Mon. haued idon sodden he com to monne sculde he
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hit sechen o boke ipritten he scal ipenchen þenne. Ah drihten ne demeð nenne Mon. efter his biginnigge. Ah al his lif scal bon suilch bôð his endinge. ʒef þet his uuel al hit is uuel 7 God ʒeфе god his ende. God ʒeue þet ure ende bo god. 7 þite þet he us lende. þe Mon. þet [nule] don na god. ne neure god lif leden. er deð 7 dom come to his dure he mei him sare adreden. þet he ne muğe þenne biden are. for þet itit ilome For þi he is pis þe biet 7 þit 7 bet bi fore dome. penne deð is attere dure pel late he biddeþ are. pel late he latheð uuel þerc ʒ þe ne mei hit don ne mare. þet achten þe to leuene pel. for ure drihten solf hit seide. A hþilke time se eure Mon. of þinchþ his mis dede. Oþer raþ þer oðer later ʒ milce he scal imeten. Ac [þe] þet þer naf nocht ibet ʒ pel muchel he haued to beten. Moni mon seit hþa rechð of þi[-] ne þe scal habben ende. Ne bidde ich na bet bo alesed a domes dei of bende. lutel he þat þet is pine. 7 lutel he hit scaped þipce heþ te is þer þa saule þuneð þu biter þind þer blapeð. hefde he bon þer enne dei oðer þpa bare tide ʒ nolde he for al middener þe þerdde þer abiden. þet habbed iseid þet komen þonen þa hit pisten mid ipissen. þa purðo sorge ʒe þe þegþer. for souenihþe blisse. [7] hure blisse þe
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þe ende haued. for endelesse pine. betere is þo[-] ri pater drunch ʒ þen atter meind mid pine. Spines brede is spide spete. spa is of pilde dore. alto dore he is abuh ʒ þe ʒefð þer fore his spore. ful pombe mei lihtliche speken of hun[-] ger. 7 of festen ʒ spa mei of pine þe ne cnaþ uð [pine] þe scal a ilesten. [Hefde] he ifonded summe stunde ʒ þe polde al seggen oðer. Et lete him pere þif. child. suster. feder 7 broðer. Al he palde 7 oðerlucker don 7 oðerlucker þenchen.

137 nule] uuel 141 biet| probable textual corruption? 142 biden are] bidenare with an oblique stroke above the line and one below showing where the words should be separated 147 þe 150 ende] prec. by h subp. 158 7] in 162 abuh] te subp. after u 165 pine] om. hefde] hela
Ƿenne he bi þohnte on helle fur þe napiht ne mei quenchæn. Eure he palde her inne pape 7 ine pene punien r-Ƿið þet þe mihte helle pine bi flien 7 bi sunien Et lete him þe re al porl þele 7 orðliche blisse. for to þet much’ ele blisse cumen is murþe mid iþisse. Ipule’ nu cumen eft to þe dome þet icious er op of sede A þa dei 7 at ta dome us helpe crist 7 rede. þer þe mugen bon eþe offered 7 herde us adreden. þer he scal al son him biforen his þord 7 ec his deden. Al scal þer bon þenne ƿaƿe ine ƿene ƿuþien Þi þet þe mihte helle pine bi flien bi sunien Et lete him þe re al ƿorld þele orðliche blisse. for to þet much’ ele blisse cumen is murþe mid iþisse. Ipule’

his gult 7 þet his misdede. For him ne scameþ ne ne gromeð þe sculen bon iborgen. Ӕch þopre habbeþ scome 7 grome 7 oft fele sorge. þe dom scal sone bon idon ne lest he napiht lon[-].
ge. ne scal him na mon mene þer of streng’ þe ne of pronge. þe sculen habbeþ herdne dom þa her peren herde. þa þe uuele hol’ den þreche men 7 uuele þage re[r]de. Ec eþer þet he efþ idon sal þer þenne [be] idemet. Ӕlle þa pi sprunge bob of adam 7 of eue. Alle hi scul[es*]n cumen þider for söde þe hit ileued. þa þe habbeð pel idon efter hore mihte. to houene riche hi sculen faren forð mid ure drihte. þa þe habbeð doules perc idon. 7 þer inne bo ifunde. hi sculen faren forð mid him in to helle grunde. þer hi sculen þunien a buten are 7 ende. Ne brekeþ ne ure drihte helle gate for lesen hi of bende. Nis na sullic þech hom bo þa 7 hom bo un eade. Ne scal neure eft crist þoliþe deþ for lesen. hom of deaþe. Enes drihten helle brec his frond he ut brachte. him solf he þolede deþ for him. þel done he hom bohte. Naþde hit mei do for mei. ne suster for broþer. naþde hit sune do for
fader. ne na mon for oðer. *vre alre lauerd* for
his þrelles ipined pes a rode. vre bendes he
unbon 7 bohte us mid his blode. Pe ȝeueð
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uneðe for his luue a stuche of ure brede. Ne þen[-]
ke pe noht þet he scal deme þa quike 7 þa dede. Mu[-]
chele luue he us cudde. palde þe hit understonde
þet ure eldre misduden ȝe þe habbeð uuele on
honde. Deþ com in þis middenerde þurh þes
doules honde. 7 sake 7 sorge 7 spinc a patere
7 a londe. *vre forme fader* gult. pe abu`
ȝeð alle. þurst 7 hunger. chele 7 hete. helde
7 unhelde. þurh him deð com in þis midd[-]
nerd 7 oðer uniselde. Nere na mon elles
ded ne sec ne nan unsele. ac mihten lib`
ben eure ma a blisse 7 a hele. lutel hit þun`
cheð moni mon. ac muchel þes þa sunne.
for hpam all þolie deð þe comen of hore
cunne. *Hore sunne* 7 ec ure ægen
sare us mei of þinche. þurh sunne pe libbeð
alle in sorge 7 in spinke. Sudðen God nom
spa muchele prake for are misdede þe þe
spa muchele 7 spa ofte mis doð. þe muchen
eðe us adrede. Adam and his of sprung for are
[b]are sunne. þes fele undret pintre an hel[-]
le pine 7 an unpunne. þa þe ledden hore lif
mid unriht 7 mid prange. buten hit gode`v
milce do ho sculen bon þer pel longe. Godes
þisdom is þel muchel 7 alspa is his mihte
nis his milce naut lesse. ac bi þan ilke
ipichte. *Mare he ane mei* for ȝeuen. þen
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al folc gulte kunne. Sulþ douel mihte habben
milce. ȝif he hit bigunne. þa þe godes milce
secheð þe ipis mei ha ifinden. Ac helle king
is are les pith þa þe he mai binden. þe þe deþ
is pille mest þe he haueð þurst mede. His baþ
scal bon pallinde. his bað sca[l] bon berninde
gledo. *þurst he deþ his gode frond* þenne
his fulle fond þe God scilde alle godes frond. a pih

222 na mon] namon with an oblique stroke above the line and one below showing where the words should be separated 227 ec] foll. by hore subp. 230 pe þe] þe þe with an oblique stroke above the line and one below showing where the words should be separated 235 [b]are] þare, scribal error? 238 godes] final s. to fit within the writing-grid 236 milce] l written over a letter, possibly ð do] foll. by n subp. 244 baþ] cross bar through the ascender þ. scribal error? 245 scal] scab, scribal error? helle] foll. by is subp.
spilche freonde. Neure in helle hi com. ne þer ne come reche. þach ich elches pordes þele. Þer me mahte fæche þet his pulle seggen on. Þat pise men us seiden. 7 aboken hit þritten þer mei hit reden. Ich hit pille seggen þan þe hit hom solf nusten. þarni hom þið hore unfrome. Þif ho me pulleð lusten. vnderston' deð nu to me edi men 7 arme. Ich pulle tel' len of helle pin 7 pernin on þið herme. In helle his hunger 7 þurst 7 tpa uuele iuere. þas þolieð þa þeren màket niþin' ges here. þer is paning and pop. after eche streche. ho fareð from hete to hete. 7 hech to frure þe preche. þenne hi bið in þere he' te þe chele him þunchet blisse. þenne hi cumed eft to þe chele 7 of hete hi habbed misse. hi hem deð þa inoch nabbed hi nane blisse. Nute hi þeþer hom dep þurs mid neure nane pisse. hi þalked eure 7 secheð reste

ac 'ho/ ne muûen imeten. For þi þe ho nolden þe hpile þet ho mihten here sunne beten. ho secheð reste þer nis nan. for þi ne muûen hi es fin' den. Ac þalked peri up 7 dun 7 se pater deþ mid þinde. þo boð þa þe peren her a þænke unste[-] defeste. 7 þa þe gode biheten heste 7 nolden hit ileste. þa þe god þerc bigunnen 7 ful enden hit nolden. Nu piten her. 7 nude þer. 7 nu[-] sten. hpat hi polden. þer is bernunde pich hore saule to baþien inne. þa þe ledden here lif in perre 7 in pinne. þer is fur þet is undr' et fald hattre. þene bo ure. Ne mai quenchens salt þeter ne uerc of þe burne. þis is þet fur þet efre bernd ne mei napîht hit quen[-] chen. þer inne boð þa þe pas to lof preche men to spenchen. þa þe peren spikelemen 7 ful of uuel prechen. þa þe mihten uuel don. þe þe lef hit pes to þenchen. þe luue' den tening 7 stale. hordom 7 drunken 7 a doules perche bliþeliche spunken. þa þe peren spa le[s]'e þet me hom ne mihte ileuen. Med ierne domes men. 7 prongpise reuen. þet oðer monnes pif lof. his ægen et lete. þo þe sungede muchel 7' a drunke 7 an ete. þe
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preche mon binom his ehte. 7 leide his on horde. ðet lutel let of godes borde. 7 godes por'
de. 7 þo þe his ægen nalde cœuen þer he isech

f. 65' þe node. Ne nalde iheren godes sonde. þen[-] ne he hit herde bode. þe þet is oðers monnes þing. loure þene hit sculde. 7 peren to gredi of solure 7 of golde. 7 þa þe untro'
þnesse duden þon þe ho scu'lden bon holde 7 leten þet ho sculden don. 7 duden þet ho pol'
den. Pa þe peren eure abuten þisse por[-] des echte. 7 duden al þet þe þape gast hechte to 7 tachte. 7 alle þe þen anigerpise doulen iquemde. Pa boð nu mid him in helle fordon 7 fordemet.

The verse sermon ends imperfectly. The remainder of the folio is left blank.
Oxford, Bodleian Library
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folios 97r-110v
Transcription of Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4 fols. 97r-110v

MS Pointing: the text of D has less pointing than the other versions of the Conduct of Life. This is probably due to the text being written out in half-lines, each long-line being divided at the caesura. The line-breaks within the mise-en-page act as a guide to reading. The half-lines are retained here, but the text is adapted, for ease of reading in the parallel text edition, (see pp.). The scribe of D uses the punctus sparingly, and most often at the end of a quatrain. These occurrences are represented in this edition but will not be referred to in the notes.

There are rare occasions where the punctus is found at neither the end of the full-line or half-line: pine: line 280; suster and vader: line 284; hauene and stream: line 484;

Capitalization occurs only at the beginning of each quatrain (‘littera notabilior’) and initial characters usually sit in the double ruled lines outside of the main writing grid. These occurrences will be reflected in the text but not in the accompanying notes, except in exceptional circumstances, such as Ic in Line 1 - where the initial letter occupies six lines of the margin.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

738, 743 (\textsuperscript{x2}), 748, 755, and \textit{bat} at line 155. \textit{There are ten occasions where \textit{bet} is written out, they are found at lines: 134, 291, 371, 476, 628, 644, 656, 707, 758, 763, and once occasion where \textit{bat} is written out at line 153.}

\textit{pint\'e/n} expanded to \textit{pintren}: line 7; \textit{sten} expanded to \textit{steren}: line 143; \textit{xi} expanded to \textit{christ}: line 151; \textit{bn} expanded to \textit{ben}: line 223; imaigd expanded to \textit{imaingd}: line 272; \textit{hung\'e/} expanded to \textit{hungre}: line 278; \textit{sust} expanded to \textit{suster}: line 284; \textit{g\'a me\d}: expanded to \textit{grame\d}: line 317; \textit{bn} expanded to \textit{ben}: lines 318, 330 and 331; \textit{g\'a me} expanded to \textit{grame}: line 319; \textit{eft} expanded to \textit{after}: lines 329 and 687; \textit{asprugen} expanded to \textit{asprungen}: line 333; \textit{c\'ist} expanded to \textit{crist}: line 347; \textit{unstode} expanded to \textit{understonde} (\textit{der} inserted into the right-hand margin: see notes): line 370; \textit{xistene} expanded to \textit{christene}: line 565; \textit{xistendom} expanded to \textit{christendom}: line 567; \textit{xist} expanded to \textit{christ}: line 605; and \textit{hung} expanded to \textit{hunger}: line 625.

\textbf{Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:}

There is general agreement that the text of the \textit{Conduct of Life} found in Digby contains strong Kentish features, which I evidence below. Hall locates the manuscript as being from Christ Church, Canterbury and suggests that it was probably copied there.\textsuperscript{842} Samuels suggests ‘that the language of D showed either two layers of copying (Kent + London or London + Kent), or possibly a single scribe writing in the dialect of an area of Kent or Surrey bordering on London, i.e. North-West Kent or North-East Surrey.’\textsuperscript{843} Laing locates the language as being from West Central Kent (LAEME) stating that the ‘the language of the \textit{Poema Morale} is clearly of Kent but seems to fit best somewhat to the west of Canterbury itself.’\textsuperscript{844}

\textsuperscript{842} Hall, \textit{Early Middle English, Notes}, p.313.
\textsuperscript{843} Samuels’s views are recorded in Hill, ‘The Twelfth-Century \textit{Conduct of Life},’ p.110.
The runic letter <þ> (þorn) is written in initial position in all instances in D (§ 2.3): þanne, þegð, þingh etc., except for darf (§ 3.3). In medial position <þ> (often before final -e) and <þ> are interchangable (written a comparable number of times): ðeper, sleuhþen, ðoþe etc. and childþe, iueðe, cuðe etc. (§ 4.3). In final position D always write <þ>: ofþencheð, mislikedþe, volgæð etc. The only occurrence of <th> (§ 5) in D is in sathanas, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 Remark). D writes <h> for <þ> in two occasions in þin and þurh (§ 6.1). There are occasional writings of <d> for <þ> in D (§ 7.3): darf, aider, vnnede, dede, deade and eade. The double fricative [ðð] is simplified in sipen and sede (§ 10.2).

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout D with occasional examples of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.4): wit, hwile, iwisse, wenæð, wolde, wealde, workes, swo, Willie, wrecche, hwere, hwet and we. D writes the Tironian nota <]> (§ 13.1) throughout this text (§ 13.7) there are no instances of and being written.

Insular ȝ is retained in D alongside Caroline g (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): grameð, grunde, glede etc. and before the OE back-vowels a, o, u (§ 42.2): god, gelte, go etc. and by levelling in (beginning) (§ 42.3). The movement to <w> is not present in D, which retains <ȝ> for the fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43.6) in volgæð, hogeð, lage etc – the Kentish dialect preserved <ȝ> in this position into the fourteenth century (§ 43.6). D preserves <ȝ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): giung, giæt, vorȝet etc. Initial <ȝ> is omitted before i in ef (§ 45.4). D demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in forpreien with <ȝ> retained in þege, and iseȝen and <ȝh> in eghen (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement ìg > i (§ 48) in ani, mani and eadi is further demonstrated in D. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before d (§ 49) in sede(n). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cȝ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in beggen, siggen, liggeð (§ 50). The OE group nȝ /ŋ/ is written <ng> (§ 51,
§ 51.8 and § 51.10): longe, kinge, giung etc. with <nh>, probably /x/, written before <ð> in strenhðe (§ 51.9).

In initial position /k/ is always written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in king(e)/kinges, keðen, kedde etc. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written as <c> in cunne, cumð, come(n) etc. but <k> is found in kare and kan. Before <n> (§ 18) it is <k> in (i)knoþð and (i)knøpen/(i)knøpen but before other consonants (§ 19) it is <c> in (i)cleped, (bi)clepie and clïue and <ch> (§ 19.7) in christ, christene and christendom. D writes <qu> (§ 20) for OE cw in iqueðe, quike, quenche etc. but writes <ku> in ikuemde and kuenche (§ 20.3 and § 20.4). D writes <k> in medial position for OE velar c throughout the text: (§ 21 and § 21.1): speke, porke, likede etc. with the only occurrence of <c> (§ 22 and § 22.3) being the result of the compound godcunnesse (god + cunnesse). However, <c> is always retained in final position (§ 23 and § 23.3): ec, ac, (i)banc etc. with no evidence of <k>.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in D is <ch> (§ 27, § 28.3, § 29.3 and § 30.3): child(e), chele, muchel(e), diche, eurch etc and in þenchen, þenched (§ 32, § 32.10 and § 32.12) etc. with þingh and þingð also representing likely palatalization (§ 32.11). The rare writing of <c> /tʃ/ (§ 31 and § 31.3) is present as the more regular spelling of the pron */f* sg. ic and is found also in phlice and lichamliche. However, the writing of <c> in smac and ispinc represent possible variants with /k/ (§ 31.3).

D mostly writes <s> (§ 36.3) for /ʃ/ (§ 34) in initial position: sal, serreue, seafte etc., however, <sc> (§ 35.3) is written in scal, iscop, scete and scrud and <sch> (§ 37.2) in schameð and as <sh> in shilde. In final position /ʃ/ is <s> in fis (§ 39). OE [ts] is always written <c> in milce (§ 41).
D regularly writes voiced [v] as <v>/u> in initial position in vele, volgelō, vor/uor (§ 58 and § 58.9) etc. with less numerous <f> also written regularly in for, fremde, (a)first etc. In final position <f> is retained in lif, of, pif (§ 58.10) etc and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: ofte, giefō, lefte (§ 58.10) etc. Voicing is also regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.11) through the writing of <v>/u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in himselue, bivore(n), euele etc. with rare instances of <f> still retained: doel, doldef/doldef/deldef, lif and estin. The writing of <f> has disappeared before <d> in hadde/hedde but is retained in hauede (§58.12).

In D OE a in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): habbe, vare, babien etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.3) in man, panic, panne etc., with two rare occurrences of <o> found in ponke and monke. Before a lengthening group, OE a is always <o> (§ 61 and §61.3): longe, pronge, honde etc. D mostly writes Kentish <e> for OE æ with a mixture of <a> (§ 63 and § 63.3): hedde, elmesse, etter etc. with habbe(n), hadde, pater, hpat and vader/uader. OE e is nearly always <e> in D (§ 64 and § 64.6): bereð, ende, velde, stremne etc. with <a> in maind and the writing of <i> (Kentish form) in siggen. OE o is always written <o> in D (§ 65.1 and § 65.5): bioure, rode, borde etc. OE i is nearly always <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.9) in bidde, child(e), finden etc. with <e> written in ospreng and in nele, nelle and nesten (§ 66.9, § 66.10 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to e). For OE y, D has mostly <e> (§ 67ff and § 67.9), a feature of the Kentish dialect: dede, (vn)net, penchen etc. with <u> written in muchel/muchle/mutchel (see note at § 67.9) and sunegeden and <i> written in pingh/pingō, king(e), afirst, spich(ne), drihte/drihten, hpich, pinne and tichede OE y (§ 67.10) is <e> in fere/ver, keðen and kedde with <i> in litel/litle, hidden and hpi. D writes a mixture of <u> and the later writing of <o> for OE u (§ 68 and § 68.2) throughout the text: cumen, punie, grunde etc. and come(n), ponien, iponed etc.
D writes <o> for OE ā, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.6): *lore, one, non* etc. with rare <a> found only in *nammore* and *bihat* (cont.). In D OE āŘ is written <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): *dede, rede, adrede* etc. with <a> (§ 75.2) written once only in *naddren* (for OE *þer* see § 77ff). OE āŘ is nearly always written as <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) *mast, unhelde, lest* etc. with rare <a> (§ 79.6) written in *ani/anie* and *ani-man* (for ælc, etc. and ylce see § 81ff). For the writing of the *adv. ones* in D see § 79.9. OE ā is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.3): *he, deð, ibet* etc. (the writing of *doð* is by analogy and the writing of *hi* is the *pl. form* written for the *sg., see § 82.3*). OE ā is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.5): *mi, priste, pile/hpile* etc. OE ā is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.3): *to, dom(e), boc* etc. OE u is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): *nu, ure/vre, þu* etc.

In D OE ea (§ 86 and §87ff) before r, without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 88.1 and § 88.8): *arge, þarf, arme* etc.; before rd (§ 88.9) it is <a> in *harde, hardne* and *(mide|l)ard* with <ea> (§ 87.5) in *midden|eard*; before rn (§ 88.4) <a> is written in *parni* with <ea> (§ 87.5) found in *earninge*. The *i-umlaut of ea* before *r-combinations* (§ 89ff) is written <a> (§ 89.6) in *arminges, <e> (§ 89.6) in *smente* and <ie> (§ 89.6) in *dierne*. OE ea before l (Anglian ā), without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.6): *al and alle, ualle, palles* etc.; before ld Kentish features (§ 91.2) are demonstrated through the writing of <ia> in *pialdeð, hialde* and *bihialde* alongside *ea* in *wealden*, *ealde, fealde* etc., with two occurrences of <a> present in *alde* and *halt*. For the *i-umlaut of ea* before l combinations (Angl. mutation of ā) D always has <e> in *elder/eldre* and *helde/eldre* (§ 92ff and § 92.6). OE ea before h combinations is <e> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.5) in *hege* and *isegh*. The *i-umlaut of ea* before *h-combinations is always <i> in *mihte(n) and nihte* (§ 94.1 and § 94.4).

For OE eo before r-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.5) D writes smoothed <e> in *perc, perkes, sterre* and *herte* with <o> present in *porke/porc* and *workes/porkes* and <ie> in *hierte*. The wur group (§ 97 and § 97.5) is <u> in *purðe* but for the *i-umlaut of eo* it is <e> in *pers(e)*. OE eo
before $l$-combinations is $<e>$ (Kent § 98ff and §98.4) in selue/self. OE eo before $ht$ is always $<i>$ (§ 99.1 and § 99.4) in rihtpisnesse, unrihte, rihte and briht and fulbrihte and $<i>$ for the $i$-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.6) in burhsigð but $<e>$ in ouer-sieð. OE – WS eom is am (chiefly Angl. eam § 101).

OE eo ($a$-umlaut of $e$) is always $<e>$ in D (§ 102ff and § 103.3): vele/uule/fele, brekeð and pele. OE eo ($u$-umlaut of $e$) is mostly $<e>$ (§ 102ff and § 104.4) in heuen(e), heueriche, pereld(es) and perldliche etc. but $<o>$ in porld/poruld and porldes and pde with $<u>$ written under the influence of $w$ in suster.

The velar umlaut $io$ of $i$ (§ 105ff) is mostly $<e>$ in D (§ 105.6): seðe, seuene, bineþen etc with $<i>$ in hire. (be)nime, quike, sipen and niþer.

D contains a mixture of $<e>$ and $<ea>$ for OE eā (§ 106ff and § 106.3): ec/ec, eðlete, vnnede, deðe/deð, bred/brede and lean, eade, eade, unneade, deþe/deade, breade and eadi.] E2 The $i$-umlaut of eā (§ 107.1 and § 107.4) is nearly always $<e>$ in ileuen, alesd, temen etc. with $<ie>$ written in ihiere. OE eō (§ 108ff and § 108.5) is a mixture of Kentish $<i>$ and $<ie>$ written alongside $<e>$ and occasional $<eo>$ and $<o>$: bi, bien, isien, lief etc. alongside ben, frend, isen etc., with ison, deoflen and dofles. The $i$-umlaut of eō (§ 109 ff) is mainly $<ie>$ (Kentish form § 108.2 and § 109.6) in piestre, piesternesse, nieðe and diere, with $<eo>$ in deorlinges and feond and $<e>$ in frend.

In D OE ea after sc (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.4) is mostly $<a>$ in sal, samien, seafte etc. with $<e>$, however, the more regular writing in sel and also present in scete ($<e>$ is possibly as a result of its position between palatal and dental consonants). For the $i$-umlaut of ea after c (§ 113.4) D writes $<e>$ (see § 113.1) in chele and bicherd. OE eā after $g$ (§ 114) is $<ie>$ in giere. For OE ie after $g$ (§ 116.3) D mostly writes $<e>$ (§ 115.1): vorget, bigete, geue etc. however, $<ie>$ is regularly written in uorgiête, giue, gielde, giefið/gief and (i)giue. Similarly, for OE ie after $g$ D writes $<e>$ in gië and $<ie>$ in giët (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE ie after sc (§ 118.3) D writes $<i>$ in silde/shilde, silden and
silten. OE eo after ɪ (§ 119.1 and §120.3) is <iu> in ⦬iung, <u> in ⦬unge and <eu> in ⦬euge. OE eo after sc (§ 121.3) is written as either <u> in sulle(n) or <o> in sollen, solde(n) and sop.

OE æ + ʒ /j/ is mostly <ai> in D (§ 122.1 and § 122.4) in mai and dai, with <ei> (Kentish § 122.1) written occasionally in meī, seīð and deīe. LWS ȝēde / Anglian ȝegde (§ 123 and §123.3) is always <e> in sede(n). OE ā(Engl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + ʒ/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.3) is <ei> in mei and sein with <eg> in iseigen and ne-isegen. OE ā2 + ʒ/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.3) is <ai> in aiðer/aider and <ei> in eiðer. OE e + ʒ/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.4) is <ei> in eie, eileche and peī, and <eg> in egie, peges and pege. OE ā + ʒ/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.3) is <ei> in vorpreien and leie. OE āa + ʒ/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.3) is <eg> in egen and raketege, with <eag> still present in eagen. OE ā2 + h (§ 132.1 and § 133.3) is <e> before ɣh in heghte and <a> before ɣ in taðte. OE ō + h (§ 134.1 and § 134.4) is always <o> in vnboht, bohte, brohte etc. OE a + /y/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.4) is <ag> in draghēn, lage(n) and lage-lease. OE ā + /y/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.2) is <og> (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in moge and hogen/ogēn. OE ā + w (§ 138.1 and § 138.4) is <o> before w (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in (i)knoþed, knopen and bloþed and in the combination <ou> before w in moupe but it is written as <a> before p in iknapen and in the combination <aw> in saule. OE āo + w (§ 139.1 and § 139.4) is <e> before w in repen but <ie> (Kentish cf. 108.2) in riepen and siepe. OE āa + w (§ 140.1 and § 140.4) is <ea> in veape but <ia> (Kentish cf. § 106.2) in viape.
Ic am elder þanne ic þes a pinter 7 ec a lore ic ealdi more þanne ic dode mi wit œchte to bi more

pel longe ic habbe child ibien on porde 7 on dode þegh ic bi on þintren eald to giung ic am on rede

Vnnet lif ic habbe iled 7 giæt, me þingh, ic lede þanne ic mebiþenche þel þel sore ic me adrede

Mest al, þet ic habbe idon idelnesse 7 childe to late ic habbe me bipoæt bute god me don milce.

Vele idel ðord ic habbe iquede siþen ic speke cuode 7 vele euele deden idon þet me ofþencheð nuðe

Alto lome ic habbe igelt on porke 7 on porde al to muchel ic habbe ispent to litel ileid on horde.

Mest al þet me likede þo nu hit me misliked se þe muchel volæd his ipil himselue he bispikæd.

ic migþte habbe bet idon hadde ic þo iselæ nu ic polde ac ic ne mai vor helde ne uor unhelæ.

Eldre me is bistolen an er ic hit ipiste ne mai ic isien biuore me vor smeche ne uor miste.

Arge þe bied to donne god to euele al to þriste more eie stondeð man of man þanne him doð of criste.

Þo þet þel ne doð þer pile hi muðe ofte hit ham sel riþe þanne hi mouþe sulþ 7 riþe
Þet hi her þan siepe.

Do ech to gode þet hi mugē 45
þer pile hi bieð aliue
ne leue no man to muchel
to childe ne to piue.

Se þet hine selue vorȝet
vor þiue oþer uor childe
he scal komen on euele stede.
bute god him bi milde.

Sende sum god biuoren him
man þet pile to heuene
for betere is on elmesse biuore
þanne ben after seuene.

f. 98v

Ne hopie pif to hire þere
ne þere to his þiue.
bi for him selue eurich man
þer pile hi bieð aliue. 60

Þis is þet hine biþencheð.
þo hpile þet he mot libbe
vor hine pilleð sone uorgiȝete
þo fremde 7 þo sibbe
Se þet pel ne deð þe pile he mai
ne sal he þanne he polde.
vor manies mannes sore isþinche
habbeð ofte unholde.

Ne solde noman don aþirst
ne sleuþen pel to donne
for mani man bihoteð pel
þet hit forȝet pel sone.

Se man þet pile siker bien
to habbe godes blisce
do eure god þer hwile he mai
þanne hauedu he hit to iwisse.

Do Riche wenede siker bien
þurh þalles 7 þurh diches.
se deð his heȝhte on sikere stede
þet sent hi to heueriche. 80

Þer ne darf he habben kare
of þieue ne of þielde
þider pe sended 7 selue bereð
to little 7 to selde.

f. 98r

Þer ne darf man ben ofþred
of fere ne of þieue
þer ne mai him naht binime
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se lôpe ne se lieue.
Þider pe solden alle draghen
 wolde ge me ileûen
for þer mai hit us binime
ne king ne 'hí is serreue.
Þet beste þet pe hogeð.
Þider pe solde senden.
for þer pe mûgen hit vinden eft.
7 habben buten ende.
Se þe her deð ani god
to habbe godes ore
al he hit sel finde þer
7 hundred fealde more.
Se þet êghete pile hialde þel
þe hpile þe hi mot wealde
ðieue hi for godes loue
Þanne deð he hi þel ihialde.
Vre ispinch 7 ure itilde
is ofte iponed to aspinde.
ac þet pe doð for godes loue
eft pe sollen hit al vinde
Ne sel non euel bien vnboht.
ne no god unforSgolde.
euel pe doð al to muchel
god lesse þanne pe solde.

Se þet mest deð nu to gode
7 se þet lest to loðe
aider to litel 7 to muchel
sal þenchen eft hem bode.
Þeð me sal ure perkes þege
biuore þe heuene kinge
7 giueuen us ure workes lean
efter ure earninge.
Eurich man mid þet he haueð
mai beggen heueriche
se þet lesse 7 se þet more
here aider iliche.
Al suo on mid his panie
swó oþer mid his punde
þet is si ponderlicheste pare
þet ani man eure vonde.
7 se þet more ne mai don
mid his gode þonke

92 his\h int.
al spo pele spo se þet haueð.  
goldes vele monke.  
þ ofte god can more þanc  
þan þe him giefð þet lesse  
alle his korkes 7 alle his þeges  
is mihte 7 rihtpisnesse.  

Litel loc is gode lief  
þet cumð of gode ipille  
7 edele muchel iȝeue  
þanne si hierte is ille.  

f. 99r  

Heuene 7 erde he ouersiedð  
his eȝen bed ð ful brihte  
sunne 7 mone 7 alle sterren  
bied ð piestre on his lihte.  

Nis him ec noþing uorhole  
spo muchel bied his mihte.  
nis noþing spo dierne idon  
ne on spo þiestre nihte.  

He pot hpet þenchedð 7 hpet doð  
alle quike pihte  
nis no louerd spich is chríst  
ze no king spich is drihte.  

Heuene 7 erde 7 al þat is  
bioken is on his honde  
he deð al þat his þille is  
on sae 7 ec on londe.  

He piteð 7 pialdeð alle þing,  
he iscop alle seafte  
he prohte fis on þer sae  
7 þeges on þar lefte.  

He is ord abuten orde  
7 ende abuten ende  
he one is eure on eche stede  
þende þer þu þende  

He is buuen us 7 bineþen  
biuoren 7 ec bihinde.  
se man þet godes þille deð.  
he mai hine aiþpar uinde.  

f. 100r  

Eche rune he iherð.  
7 pot eche dede  
he þurhsigð eches ipanc  
pai hpat sel us to rede.  
Pe þet godes hesne brekeð
7 gelteð spo ilome
hpet sulle pe siggen oder don
at to heæge dome.
Þer sulle deoflen bi spo uele
ðet willeð us vorpreien
nabbeð hi no þing uorgeðe
of þan þet hi isegen.
Al þet pe misdenden hier
hi pilleð keðen þere.
bute pe habben hit ibet
þer hpile pe hier pere.
Al hi habbeð on her prite
þet pe misdenden hiere
þegh pe hi nisten ne isegen
hi peren vre iueren.
Hpet sulle þo horlinges don
þo spikele 7 þo vorsporene
apei spo uele bed icleped
7 spo viape icorene
Pei hpi þeren hi bigete
7 to hpi iborene
þet sullen ben to deade idemd
7 euer mo vorlorene.

Ech man sel himselue þer
biclepien bitelle 7 deme
his œgen perc 7 his iþanc
to pitnesse teme.
Ne mai him no man al spo pel
demen ne spo rihte
vor non ne knopeð hine spo pel
bute one ure drihte.
Ech man pot him selue best
his porkes 7 his pille
se þet lest pot seidío ofte mest
7 se þet al pot is stille.
Nis no pitnesse al spo muchel
spo mannés œgen hierste
þegh 5po sigge þet he bi hol
him self he pot his smerte.
Eurich man him demen sel
to deðe ðeper to life
se pitnesse his selue porkes
to aider hine sel drieue

215 his} prec. by is subp.
Al þet ech man haueð idon
seðe he com to manne.
spich hit þere on boc iþrute
isien he sel hit þanne.
Drihte ne demeð nenne man
bi his biginninge
al his lif sel ben iteald
bi his endinge.

f. 101r
Ef se ende is euel hit is al euel
7 god ef is se ende
God geþe þet ure ende bi god
7 þite hpþet he us lende.
Se man þet neure nele don god
ne neure god lif leden
er deð 7 dom come to his dure
he mai him sore adreden.
þet he þanne ore bidde ne mugen
vor þet bilimpeð ilome
he is pis þet bit 7 bete
7 bet biuoren dome
þanne deað is at þare dore
to late he biddeð ore
to late uorlet þet euele porc
þet hit ne mai don nammore
Senne let þe 7 þu nah hoe
þanne þu ne miht hi do more
he sot þet spo abit
to habben godes ore
Spo ileuen þe hit mugen
vor drihten self hit sede
on hpiche time se þe man
ofþencheð his misdede.
Oþer raðer oþer later
milce he sel imeten
ac se þ(et) nauðeð hier naht ibet
muchel he haueð to beten.

f. 101v
Sum man saið hpo reðh of pine
þet sel habben ende
ne recche ic bote bi ic alesd
on domes dai of bende.
Litel he pot hpþet pine is.
7 litel hi iknopoð
hþich hete is þer þe saule þoneð
hu biter þind þer bloþeð.

Ef he hedde þer ibie.
on oþer tþo itide
nolde he uor al middeneard
þþridde þer abiden.
þet seden þþet comen þannes
þet hit þisten mid ipisse
þer purh sorge seue þier
vor seuenihte blisce.

Vre blisce þet ende haued
vor endelesse pine
betere þere drinke þori þer
þanne atter imaiingd mid þine.

Spines brede is spiþe spete
þpo is of pilde diere
al to diere he hi beþð
þet þieþ þereuore his spiere.

Lihtliche mai ful þombe þpeke
of hungre 7 of þurste
þpo mai of þine þet not þat is
þine þe þere mo sel leste.

Hauede he uondered sume stunde
he polde siggen al oþer
õðlete him þere pif 7 child
suster. vader. moder 7 þroðer.

Al he polde oþer don
7 oþerlaker þenche
þanne he þohte of helle ver
þet nopþing ne mai quenche.

eft he polde her on þo
7 on pope þunie
þiþ þet he moste helle uer
bifliþen 7 bisunie.

õðlete ham þere al þerldes þele
7 þerldiche blisce
for to þære muchele merhþe come
þet is merhþe mid ipisse

Ic pille nu come to þon dome
þet ic þeu of er sede
on þan deie 7 on þan dome
vs helpe crist 7 rede.

Pe mûgen ea þe ben ofherd
7 harde vs mai ondreden
þer ech sel him biuoren sien
his perkes 7 his dede.
Al sel þanne bi þer cuð
þet men hier luðen 7 stelen
al sel þanne ben vnproge
þet men her hidden 7 helen.

Pe sullen alre manne lif
iknapen spo ure høgen
þer sullen eveninges ben
þo hege 7 þo loge.
Ne sel þed no man samien þer
ne darf he him ondreden
ef him her ofþeneð his gelt
7 beted his misdede.
Ham ne schameð ne ne grameð
þet sullen ben iborðe
þodre habbed same 7 grame
7 fele oþre sorȝe.
Se dom sal ben sone idon
ne lested he noht longe
ne sal non him bimene þer
of strenhde ne of pronge.
Þo sullen habbe hardne dom
þet her peren harde
þet euele hielden wrecche men
7 euele lagen arerde
Ech efter þet he hauð idon
sal þanne ben idemed
blþe mai he þanne ben
þet gode hauð iquemed
Alle þo þet asprungen bieð
of adame 7 of euen
alle hi sullen þider cumen
to soþe ðe mugen ileuen.

Þo þet habbed þel idon
efter hire mihte
to heueneriche hi sullen vare
vorð mid ure drihte
Þo þet prohten dofles perc
7 peren þer inne iuonde
þo sullen vare vorð mid him
into helle grunde.
Þer hi sullen þonien ai
bute 7 ende
ne brekê neure eft crist helle dure
to alesen hi of bende.
Is hit ponder þagh hem bi þo
ne þagh hem bi þonne
ne þoleð neure eft drihten ded
to lesen hi of deade
Ones drihten helle brece
7 his frend hut brohte
him self þolede deð for ham
pel dierhe hi bohte.
Nolde hit more do vor meie
ne suster vor broþer
nolde hit sune do vor vader
ne no man vor oþer.
Vre louerd vor his piales
ipines pes on þo rode
vre bendes he vnband
he bohte us mid his blode.

Pe geuede unnaede uor his loue
a stecche of ure breade
ne þenche þe naht þet he sel
demen quike 7 deade.
Muchel loue he kedde us
polde þe hit understonde
þet uere elders misdeden
harde þe habbed on honde.
Dead com on þis midelard
þurð þes defles onde.
7 senne 7 sorge 7 ispinc
on se 7 on londe.
Vres uormes uader gelt
þe abegged alle.
7 his ospring eer him
on harme bieð biuallle.
Huger 7 þurst hete 7 chele
ecðe 7 al unhelðe
þurh dead com on þis midelard
7 oþer vniselðe
Nere no man elles dead
ne siec ne vnvele
ac mihte libben euer mo
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on blisce 7 on hele.
Litel hit þencheð manie men
al muchel þes si senne
vor hþi þolied alle dead
þet comen of þo kenne.

f. 104v
Here senne 7 ec vre
sore us mai of þenche
for senne pe alle hier
in sorþe bieð 7 in spinche.
SÞede God spo muchele preche
dede vor one misdeede
de þet gelteð ofte 7 muchel
þat sal us to rede.
Adam 7 his ospreng
al vor one bare senne
þeren vele hundred þer
on helle 7 on unpenne.
Þo þet ledeð here lif
mid unrihte 7 mid þronge
bute hit godes milce do
hi sulle bi þer pel longe.
Godes milce is spo muchel
7 al spo is his mihte.
nis him no þing litlende
ac bi emliche þihte.
He one mai more vorgþue
þanne al uolc gelte tunne.
se deuel self mihte habbe milce
ef he hit bigunne.
Hþo spo godes milce secð
ipis he hi mai vinde.
ac helle king is spiþe hard
þið þo þet he mai binde.

f. 104r
Se þet eure deð his pille mest
he sal him þerse mede
his behð sal bi pällinde pich.
his bed berninde glede.
Pers he doð his gode pine
þanne his locðe viende
isilde us eure drihte crist
þið spiche locðe frende.
Neure ich on helle ne com
ne comen ic þer ne recche.
þeh ich alle þerlide þele
Ich pille 'teō siggen ēu

₇ on boc hit stant irprite
₇ alle pe mugen hit rede.

Ich hit pille siggen þan
₇ hit ham selue nesten
₇ þarni hi piō here vnþines
ef hi me pilleð hlestén.

Vn’der’stondeð nu to me
eadi men 7 arme
ich pille of helle pine
þarni ēu 9 fram harme.

In helle is hunger 7 þurst
eule þpo iueren
þos pine þolied þo þet peren
me’te niþinges hiere.

Per is sorinesse 7 pop

f. 105

efter eche strete
hi uareð vram hete in to chele
₇ fram chele in to hete.

Panne hi in þare hete bied
se chele ham þenched blisce
þanne hi to chele cumeð
of hete hi habbed misse

Eider ham dêð þo inoh
nabbedi hi none blisce
niteði hi þper hi þonið mest
mid neure none ipisse

Hi þalked eure 7 reste secheð
ac hi ne mugen imeten
vor hi nolden þo hi mihte
hire sennen ibeten

Hi secheð reste þer non nis.
for hi ne mugen iuinde
ac þalked þeri up 7 dun
spo þater dœð mid pinde.

Pet sãden þo þet þere her
on þonke unstedwænest
₇ þo þet þiheten gode
₇ nolden hit ðlestè
þo þet agunne godes perc
₇ hit fulendil ðolde

₄₄1 Vnderstondeð] der int. and marked for insertion
₄₄₈ meþnþings[ te int. and marked for insertion
nu peren hier 7 nu þer
7 deden þet hi polde

f. 105\(^v\)

þer is pich þet eure þald
þet sullen bāpien inne
þo þet ledden here lif
in pele 7 in senne.
þer is ver þet is hudred fealde
hotter þanne is vre
ne mai hit kuenche no þeter
hauene. stream. ne sture.
þer is ver þet eure brennèð
ne mai hit no þing quenchen
þer inne sendeð þo þet loueden
precche men to spenchen.
7 þo þet pere spikle men
7 ful of euele þrenchen
7 þo þet mihte vnriht do
7 lief hit hem pes to þenche.
þo þet louede hordom 7 stale
7 reauinge 7 drunke
7 on þos lòpès diefe perkes
to bledeliche spunke.
þo þet peren lease men
ne mihte me hem ileuen
7 medeþierned domesmen
7 prangþise ireuen.
þo þet òþres þif haueden lief
7 here þogen êðete
7 þo þet spîþe senegedên
on drunke 7 on hete.

f. 106\(^r\)

þe precche man binam his god
7 leide hit on horde
þe litel let of godes bode
7 of his spete porde.
7 se þet his þogen noldþe þeven
þer he isæð þo nide
ne noldþe ihiere godes men
þer he set at his biede.
7 þo þet peren ðetseres
of þise pordes ðæhte
7 deden al þet se lophe gost

485 Þer originally the letter þ was miswritten within the main body of the text when it should have been an enlarged capital, as it begins a quatrain. A different hand adds þ within the ruling for the 'litterae notabiliores' 506 on | om with third minim subp.
ham tichede to 7 taðte.
7 alle þo þet anie pise
þo diefe er ikuemde
þo sullen ben voð mid him
vordon 7 vordemde.

Bute þo þet vor þuhte ham
here sennen 7 here misdeden
7 gunnen here sennes beten
7 betere lif leden.

Þer bieð naddren 7 snaken
eueten 7 ec fruden
þo tereð 7 freteð þo þet euel speked
þo on’d’ulle 7 þo prude.

Neure sunne þer ne sinð
ne mone ne no sterre
þer is muchel godes hete
7 muchel godes herre.

Eure þer is euel smac
þiersternesse 7 eðie
nis þer neure oþer liht
þanne þieter leie.

Þer liggede attliche feond
in stronge raketeðe
þet bieð þo þet þeren mid gode
engles spipe heðe.

Þer bieð attliche vend
7 eiliche pihte
þo sulle þo arme saule iseon
þet gelten þurh isihðe.

Þer is se loðe sathanas
7 belzebub se alde.
eaðe hi mugen bi ofherd
þet sullen hine bihialde.

Ne mai non herte hit iþenche
ne no tunge telle
hu muchele pinen 7 hu uele
bieð inne helle.

Þo þo pinen þet þer bieð
nelle ich þeu noht liegen
nis hit bute gamen 7 glie
al þet man her mai driegen.

Ne deð ham noping spo þo
on þo loðe bende

528 ondule] d int. and marked for insertion
Per bieð þo heþene men
þet peren lægelease
þer naht of godes bode
ne of godes hesne.

Euele christene men
hi bieð here iuere
þo þet here christendom
euele hielden hiere.
7 þet hi bieð on perse stede
in nifer helle grunde
ne sulle hi neure comen ut
vor marke ne vor punde.

Ne mai ham noþer helpe þer
bene ne elmesse
vor naht hi solden bidde þer
ore ne ðeuenesse.

Shilde him ech þe hƿile he mai
Þið þo helle pine
7 þarni ech his frend þer þið
spo ich pille mine.

Þo þet sildent hem ne cunne
ich ham pille teche
ich kan bien aider ef ich sal
lichames 7 saule leche.

Lete þe þet god vorbiet
alle mankenne
7 do þel spo he us hot
7 þarni us þið senne.

Louie god mid ure hierte
7 mid al ure mihte
7 ure emcristene spo us self
spo us lereð drihte.

Al þet men ret 7 singð
biuoren godes borde
al hit hongeð 7 halt
bi þise tþam porde.

Godes læge he uoluelð
þo niepe 7 þo ealde.
þet þos tþo loue haueð
7 pel hi pile healde
Ae hi bieð harue ihialde pel
spø ofte pe gelteð alle
vor hit is strang to stonden veste
7 liht hit is to ualle.

Drihte christ us ọgjeue
stonde þet pe mote
7 of alle ure vallen
he one us come to bote.

Pe pilneð efter perides pele
þet longe nele ileste
7 leggeð almost ure ispinch
on þinge vnstedeueste

Spingke pe vor godes loue
spø pe doð vor ðe
ere pe so ofte bicherd
ne spo euele bikastë.

Ef pe polden herie gode
spø pe doð arminges
pe mihten richer bi mid him
þanne eorles ðer kinges.

Ne muðen pe us biperien her
þið þurste ne þið hungre
ne þið elde ne þið dead
se eldre ne se ðungre.

Per nis hunger ne þurst
deð hunhelðe ne elde
to ofte man bicareð þis lif
7 þet al to selde.

Pe solden us bispensche bet
ofte 7 pel ilome
hpæt pe bieð, to hþam pe sulle
7 of hþam pe come.

Hu little hpilpe pe bieð hier
hu longe elles hwere
hpæt we muðer habben hier
7 hpæt vinden þere.

Ef þere þise men
þus pe solden þenche
bute pe purðe us iper
þis porld us pile adrenche.

Vor almihti godes luue

625 Þer originally the letter þ was miswritten within the main body of the text when it should have been an enlarged capital as it begins a quatrain. A different hand adds þ within the ruling for the ‘litterae notabiliores’ 631 hþet] h has been placed in error in the ruled grid for capitalized initials when it does not begin a quatrain; it is not a capital and is not touched red
ute pe us biperien
þises precches peldes loue
þet hi ne muçen us derien.

f. 108v
Mid uastinge elmesse 7 mid ibede
þerie pe us pið senne
mid þo þepenne þet god haueð
içeuen al mankenne.
Lete pe þo brode strete.
7 þane pei bene
þet leded þo ningende del to helle
of men 7 mo ich þene.
Go pe þane narepe þei
7 þane pei grene
þer uord vareð litel volc
ac þet is vair 7 scene.
Si brode strete is ure ipil
þet us is loð to letе
þo þet al volgeð hire hipil
hi vareð þo brode strete.
Hi muçen lihtliche vare
mid þare niþerhelde
þurð one gutlæase pode
in to one brode velde.
Se narepe þei is godes hesne
þer vorð vareð þel viape
þet bied þo þet hier ham silten
pið echen vneape.
Go pe alle þane þei
he us pile bringe
mid þo veape vaire men
biforen heuenkinge.

f. 109r
Þer is allær mergþe mest
mid englene songe
se þet is a þusend pintre þer
ne þingð hit him naht longe.
Se þet lest haueð blisce he heð spo muche
ne biddeð he no more
se þet þo blisce let vor þос
hit him sel repen sore.
Ne mai non euel ne no pane

650 bene] nsub. after e 659 hire hipil] 'hipil 'hire: two oblique strokes preceding both hipil and hire mark them for trs.
673 mergþe] [written over k] glossed õy in the left hand margin in a later hand
bi in heueriche
THE SER bi poninge vele
eh ofer vnliche.
Sume THE SER habbed lesse merghe
7 sume THE SER habbed more
eh efter than THE SER he dede
efter THE SER he spanc sore.
NE sel THE SER bi bred ne pin
ne ofer kennes este
God one sel bi eches lif
7 blisce 7 eche reste.
NE sal THE SER bi scete ne scrud
ne pordes pele none
ac si merghen THE SER men us bihat
al sal ben god one.
NE mai no merghen bi spo muchel
spo is godes isinhhe
hi is soh sune 7 briht
7 dai bute nihte.

THE SER is pele bute pane
7 reste buten ispinche
se THE SER mai 7 nele theder come
sore hit sel vorpenche.
THE SER is blisce buten trege
7 lif buten deade
THE SER eure sullen punie THE SER
blide hi bieod 7 eade.
THE SER is georghen buten elde
7 elde buten vnhelde
nis THE SER sorge ne sor non
ne non vniselpe.
THE SER me sel drihten isen
spo ase he is mid ipisse
he one mai 7 sel al bien
engles 7 mannes blisce.
THE SER ne bi here eagen naht
al iliche brihte.
nabbedo hi naht iliche muchel
alle of godes lihte
ON bise liue pe nere noht
alle of one mihte
ne THE SER ne sullen hi habben gode

704 hit hit (dit)
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alle bi one rihte.
Þo sullen more of him iseon
þet hine luuede more
7 more iknoopen 7 isien
his mihte 7 his ore.

f. 110vir
On him hi sullen vinden al
þet man mei þer to lesten
in liue boc hi sullen isien
þet her hi ne pisten.
Crist one sel ben inoh
alle his deorlinges
he one is muchele more 7 betere
þan he aþe oþre þinges.
Inoh he haueð þet hine haueð
þet alle þing haueð on þealde
of him to isien nis non sed
spo vair he is to bihialde.
God is spo mere 7 spo muchel
in his godcunnesse
þet al þet he þes 7 is
is vele perse 7 lesse.
Ne mai hit no man oþre
siggen mid ipisse
hu muchele merged þo
þet bieð in godes blisce
Vten eftin þiderpard
mid aldre þeernoulnesse
7 vorsen þisne mideard
mid his pouernesse
Æf pe vorsied þis loþe lif
vor heuenriches blisce
þan he selð us crist þet eche lif
to medes on ecnesse.

f. 110vers
To þare blisce us bringe god
þet rixeð buten ende.
þan he ure saule vnbind
of lichamlice bende.
Crist ægæe us lede spich lif
7 habbe spichne ende
þet pe moten þider cumen
þan he pe hennes pende
A-M-E-N

765 the verse-sermon concludes with stretched majuscules; between each is a waved filler line
The remainder of the folio is filled with Latin verse.
London, British Library
MS Egerton 613,
folios 64⁰-70ᵛ
Transcription of London, British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 64r-70v

MS Pointing: E2 has regular pointing with the punctus usually occurring at the end of each half-line (mid-line), with occasional exceptions. These occurrences, which are represented in the text, will not be listed in the notes.

A punctus can also be found after: sunne, mone and dei.: line 76; deð: line 79; eorðe: line 81; eal: line 112; cume: line 124; seid: line 133; suster: line 148; sunne and sorge: line 192; sic 197; pine: line 206; hé: line 242; á: line 252; tered, freteð and fulle: line 272; ulde: line 320; died: line 321; aquierne: line 360; and murhðe: line 363.

The initial letter of each couplet, after the first folio, is distinguished from the rest of the text by being coloured red and contained within a specially-ruled parallel column. They are often faded and sometimes illegible. I have given them as capitals in my transcription, although they are not always capital in shape, to distinguish them, as was intended, from the rest of the line. Exceptions will be noted in the commentary. The alternate lines begin with a miniscule and are indented. The first recto differs from the rest of the text, as only the first initial letter is enlarged and coloured red. All of the following letters which begin lines, regardless of whether they begin a couplet or not, are capitalized and touched red.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

Throughout the text ð has been expanded to þet at lines: 51, 82, 98, 99, 101, 114, 122, 139, 157, 158, 169, 188, 189, 190, 221, 247, 266, 278, 286, 288 [32], 301, 302, 305 [32], 311, 315, 332, 336, 344, 351 and 356.

There are only seven occasions where þet is written out, and they are at lines: 13, 68, 81, 122², 253 and 264.
hi expanded to him: lines 26, 27, 32, 40, 77, 107, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 116, 148, 151, 156, 161, 162, 166, 182, 194, 223, 268, 297, 330, 350, 352, 365, 366\textsuperscript{(x2)} and 368; na expanded to nan: lines 37 and 166; ma expanded to man: lines 38, 184 and 199; co expanded to com: lines 117, 191, 196 and 219; pet expanded to peter: line 142; heo expanded to heom: lines 179\textsuperscript{(x2)}, 180, 182, 224, 233, 234, 266, 287, 295, 299, 319 and 344; come expanded to comen: line 200; na expanded to nam: line 203; fra expanded to fram: line 230; cume: expanded to cumen: line 294;

The scribe of this text uses oblique strokes above vowels as markers of length. However, the frequency of these marks is unusual and not altogether regular – although some patterns can be seen.\textsuperscript{845} All of these instances will be shown in the text and in the notes.

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

Both of the texts of the Conduct of Life within Egerton contain strong South-Western linguistic features, as evidenced below. Laing (LAEME) believes the language of both versions is of south-west Worcestershire with the text of E1 possibly being more northern.\textsuperscript{846} Both texts, which were copied from the same exemplar, retain archaic grammar and orthography, with the scribe of E2 being more conservative than the scribe of E1.\textsuperscript{847} This has led Laing to believe that the text may well be deliberately archaistic.\textsuperscript{848}

In initial position, E2 mostly has the runic letter \(<\dd> (\textit{þorn}) (§ 2.4): ðen, ðanne, ðeh, ðincð etc., however, \(<\dd> is also frequently written (§ 3.1): ði, ðe, ðer etc. In medial and final position \(<\dd> (\textit{eth}) is mostly written (§ 4.4): iqueðen, syððen, þincð, bisþikeð etc. with rare \(<\dd> (§ 4.4): nanþing, cuþe, nuþe, þ-selþe, unhelþe and folþep, beþep, deþ and recþ. The only occurrence of \(<\th> (§ 5) in E2

\textsuperscript{845} These marks are discussed by Hill in ‘Notes on the Egerton e Text’, pp. 355-357.
\textsuperscript{847} In addition to the examples provided here, see Hill, ‘Notes on the Egerton e Text’, pp. 353-357.
\textsuperscript{848} Margaret Laing, ‘The value of texts surviving in more than one version’, p. 576
is in *sathanas*, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 Remark). The graph <d> is written for <ð> once only in *ladliche* (§ 7.6), a reading shared with both J and M. There are occasional occurrences of the dental stop /t/ written for <ð>/<þ> in low stress positions (§ 8 and § 8.2): *pinchet, míis lichet, forgìtet* etc., and, on one occasion, assimilation of <þ> (§ 8 and § 8.2) in *mid te*.

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout E2 without any examples of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.5). The Old English ligature <œ> is regularly found in E2 (§ 12.1): *æm, pælde, ilæd, ær* etc. E2 writes the Tironian nota <ṭ> (§ 13.4) with rare and being written on only eight occasions (§ 13.2).

Insular ȝ is retained in E2 alongside Caroline g (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): *gramet, grunde, glede* etc. and before the OE back-vowels a, o, u (§ 42.2): *god, gulte, gæð* etc. and by levelling in (*biginnige*. The movement to <w> is not present in E2, which retains <ȝ> for the fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43.7) in *folæþ, mage, ægen* etc. and <ȝh> in *mœþe* (§ 43.7). E2 preserves <ȝ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): *gýng, gýet, guinge* etc. Initial <ȝ> is retained before i in *gif/gíeþe* (§ 45.4). E2 retains <ȝ> in *egen, pegen, pregen* etc. where all other MSS demonstrate a transition to a palatal, in at least one instance, through the writing of <i> (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not, however, negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement ȝi > i (§ 48) in *eni, mani* and *gædi* is further demonstrated in E2. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before d (§ 49) in *sede* and *ised* (§ 49.4). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cʒ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in *bigge, seggen, ligget* etc. The OE group nʒ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51.1 and § 51.14): *længe, kæng, strengðe* etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/, written <nc>, before <ð> in *strengðe* (§ 51.12) and before <þ> in *prancþe/prancþe* (§ 51.15); <n> is absent in *bi-ginigæ* (§ 51.13). The OE prefix ge is retained on two occasions in E2 in *ge-lome* and *ge-sceafte* (§ 57).
In initial position <c> for /k/ is retained before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in cuðe, cudde, cunne etc. with <k> only found in king(e)/kinges. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written as <c> in cuðe, cuþe, cumeð etc. but <k> is found in kinning, kare and kan. Before <n> (§ 18) it retains <c> in cnapað/(i)napæð and (i)napæ as it is before all other consonants (§ 19) in (i)clupede, clþe, criste etc. E2 writes <qu> (§ 20) for OE cw in iqueðen, quike and iquemde but retains the OE form <cw> in cƿeman and icpemed. E2 writes <k> in medial position for OE velar c throughout the text: (§ 21 and § 21.4): speke(n), bi-sþikeð, siker etc. with rare occurrences of <c> (§ 22 and § 22.4) found in: licede and breœð. However, <c> is always retained in final position (§ 23 and § 23.4): ac, ec, þanc etc. with no evidence of <k>. The writing of <ch> for velar c is most frequently found in E2 (§ 25 and § 25.3): mis-lichet, spunque, spichele and ech/æch.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in E2 is <ch> (§ 27, § 28.4, § 29.4 and § 30.4): child(e), chilce, muchel(e), smeche, ech, æurich etc and in ðinche (§ 32 and § 32.13) and ðenche (§ 32 and § 32.15) etc. with <c> /tf/ (§ 31 and § 31.4) regularly written in ic; the occasional writing of <c> in elc, eure-etc, spilc, hpilc and sellic are possible variants with /k/ (§ 31.4). E2 regularly writes <c> in þincð/ðincð, of-þincð, iðenœð and bi-þenœð, variants likely with /k/ (see § 32.1, § 32.14 and § 32.16); the writing of <c>, probably /k/, is also found in recþ where palatal /tf/ might be expected (see § 33 and § 33.4). E2 always writes <sc> (§ 35.4) for /ʃ/ (§ 34) in initial position: sceal, scop, sceafte etc. and in medial position in fisces (§ 38). OE [ts] is always written <c> in milce (§ 41).

E2 always writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position in fele/fale, folgþp, for (§ 58 and § 58.13) etc., in final position in lif, of, suff (§ 58.14) etc. and in medial position where it is adjacent to one unvoiced sound: him-sulfne, oft. æfter (§ 58.14) etc. However, voicing is regularly
demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.15) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in him-selue, uuel, heuene etc. with some instances of ACEMENT still retained: be-fore(n)/bi-fore, alife, pife/pyfe etc. The writing of ACEMENT has disappeared before d in hadde/hedde (§58.16).

In E2 OE a in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): habbe, faren, baðie etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.4) in manne, þanc, þanne etc. Before a lengthening group, OE a is always <a> (§ 61 and § 61.4): lange, prange, hande etc. E2 mostly writes WML <e> for OE æ with a mixture of <a> (§ 63 and § 63.4): hefð. elmesse, peter(e) etc. with <œ> in aefter and baœ and <œ> in habbe/habb. hafð. haueþ/haueþ and hadde. OE e is always <e> in E2 (§ 64 and § 64.7): beren, ende, felde, strencð/e/strencð etc. OE ø is always written <o> in D (§ 65.1 and § 65.5): bi-fore, bibode, borde etc. E2: OE i is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.11) in bidde, child(e), finde(n) etc. with <y> written in a-pyste (§ 66.11) and occasional <œ> in pule, pulle, pulleð (see § 66.4 for the influence of w) and nuste(n) (probable WML form, see § 66.6 and § 66.12) and <œ> in nele and nelle (§ 66.14 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to ə). For OE y, E2 has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.11), a feature of WML texts: dude, gulte, muchel etc. with a significant number of <i>/<y> writings also present: þincð/þincð. michel(e)/myðchel, king(e) and <œ> written once in iðencð. OE y (§ 67.15) is <u> in lutel, lute, hud. fur(e). cuðe and cudde and <œ> in litel, lite and hpi. E2 retains traditional <œ> for OE u (§ 68 and § 68.4) throughout the text: cume(n). punien, grunde etc.

E2 writes mostly <a> for OE ā, probably the most conservative of the MSS, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.6): ane, nan, lac etc. with <œ> only present in pori. In E2 OE æ was written <œ> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): dede, rede, adrede etc. with OE æ (§ 75.4), retained in forlaete (for OE þer see § 77ff). OE æ2 is regularly written <œ> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) mest, unhelpe, lest etc. with OE æ (§ 79.1) a regular feature in this text: ær, æurich, œure, œura-ma, ilæd, læde/læden and æniman (for ælc, elc and ylc see § 81ff). OE ə is nearly always <œ> (§ 82 and § 82.4): he. dep/doi, dep/doi.
cweman etc with <ie> written in dieð and <eo> written in beot. OE ð is mostly <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.6): mi. hpile. þrist etc. but <u> is written in spunes (§ 83.2). OE ð is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.4): to, dom(e), boc’boke etc. OE u is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.4): nu, ure/vre, þu etc.

In E2 OE ea (§ 86 and § 87ff) before r, without lengthening (§ 88.11), is regularly written with OE <æ> (§ 88.1 and § 87.5): serpe, nærepene and þærf, with traditional <ea> (§ 87.5 and § 88.1) found in ðearf and earme and fronted <ie> (§ 87.5) in ðierf and spierite; before rd (§ 88.12) it is mostly <ea> in (middan)-eard, (middle)eard and hearde, with <æ> in hardne and <e> found in herde; before nn (§ 88.13) <ea> is once more written in earninge, <æ> in parnie/parine and <e> in perni. The ð-umlaut of ea before r-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <æ> (§ 89.7) in erminges but <u>, from WS /y/, in durne (§ 89.7 and § 89.3) and <eo>, a SW form, in smeorte (§ 89.7). There is considerable variance in E2, the most conservative version of the text, for OE ea before l, without lengthening (Anglian a), which is regularly written <ea> (§ 90ff and § 90.4): eal and ealle, fealle, pealdæ etc. with <æ> written in sel and several examples of <æ>: all(e) and al, palle and salt; before ld the writing of <ea> (§ 91.2 and § 91.6) is regular: pealden, eald(e), fealdæ etc. with <æ> written in pælde and <æ> written in helt. For the ð-umlaut of ea before l combinations (Angl. mutation of a) E2 has <æ> in elder and elde (§ 92ff and § 92.7) but presents SW forms with the writing of <u> in uldre and ulde and <y> in yléde. OE ea before h combinations is mostly <æ> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.6) in hege and iseh, with <æ> in heage. The ð-umlaut of ea before h-combinations is always <i> in nihte(n) and nihte(s) (§ 94.1 and § 94.5).

For OE eo before r-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.6) E2 always writes <eo> (a form retained longest in the WML and the South § 96.1 and § 96.2) in peorch(e)/peorc, peorkes, heorte and steorre. The wur group (§ 97 and § 97.6) is <u> in purðe and for the ð-umlaut of eo it is <u> in purs(e) (see note to § 97.6). OE eo before l-combinations is twice <æ> (§ 98.4) in selue/self but mostly <u> (SW § 98ff and § 98.7). OE eo before ht is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.5) in rihtpisnesse, unriht/un-rihte, rihte and briht(e) and <i> for the ð-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.7) in ouersihð and ðurh-
sihð. OE – WS eom is æm and eom (SW form § 101). OE eo (a-umlaut of e) is mostly <e> in E2 (§ 102ff and § 103.4): fele/uile . brekeð. pele and unfreme with <e> written in fale and <ae> in feale (possibly by association with the antonym féawe, see § 103.4). OE eo (u-umlaut of e) is regularly <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.4) in heuen(e), heuenriche, heuenliche etc. with <eo> (WML form) present in heouene and <o> written in porulde and pode with <u> written under the influence of w in suster.

The velar umlaut io of i (§ 105ff) is regularly written as <eo> (WML and SW form) in E2 (§ 105.7): sodðen. seouene. bi-neoðen. heore/heora etc, the writing of <u> and <üş> in suđde and syððen demonstrates the lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW (IWS syddan. see § 105.3); <u> is also written in icuped and bi-clupien alongside <i> in (be)-nime and quike.

For OE êa (§ 106ff and § 106.4) E2 contains a mixture of variants with <e> in ech/ec. ë- late, uneðe and brede, <ea> in eaðe. deað and reauing and <ie> (see § 106.2) in iepe. une- ieðe/uniepe. lien. briede and <ie> (see § 106.2) in gedi. The ʃ-umlaut of êa (§ 107.1 and § 107.5) is nearly always SW <u> (see § 107.1) in ihurð. ihuren and ilusd with <e> only written in rhyming position (see § 107.1), therefore, an unlikely representation of the dialect, in ileue. leued and temen. OE êo (§ 108ff and § 108.6) is mostly written <eo> in E2, a form associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1): beo(n). seon. freond etc. with <e> written once in ben, <ie> in lief and <i> in sic. The ʃ-umlaut of êo (§ 109 ff) is a mixture of <eo>, associated with the South and the WML, and <u> (§ 109.7): freond. deore and neode and <u>, possibly from WS y (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /œ/ from êo, in frund. fund. bustre. ðustrenesse and dure.

In E2 OE ea after sc (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.5) is <ea> in sceal and sceafte, <ae> in sæl, <a> in skal. scamian. scamet and scame with <ie> written once in sciete. For the ʃ-umlaut of ea after c (§ 113.5) E2 writes <e> in chele and bicherd but SW <u> (see § 113.1) in chule. OE êa after g (§ 114) is <e> in ger. For OE ie after g (§ 116.4) E2 mostly writes SW <i>/<û> (§ 115.1) and forgitet.
\textit{giue, giued} etc with \textit{<u>} for \textit{gut} and \textit{<ie>} in \textit{gieuen} (both also likely SW forms). Similarly, for OE \textit{ie} after \textit{g} E2 writes SW \textit{<ye>} in \textit{gyet} and SW \textit{<u>} in \textit{gut} (§117.1 and §117.2). For OE \textit{ie} after \textit{sc} (§118.4) E2 writes SW \textit{<u>} in \textit{sculde(n)} and \textit{sculdeo}. OE \textit{eo} after \textit{g} (§119.1 and §120.4) is \textit{<y>} in \textit{gýng}. \textit{<u>} in \textit{gunge}. \textit{<eo>} in \textit{geonger} (see §119.1) and \textit{<eu>} in \textit{geugebe}. OE \textit{eo} after \textit{sc} (§121.4) is written as either \textit{<u>} in \textit{scule(n)} or \textit{<o>} in \textit{scolde(n)} and \textit{sop}.

OE \textit{æ} + \textit{ʒ}/\textit{j}/ is nearly always \textit{<ei>} (WM §122.1) in E2 (§122.5) in \textit{mei, dei/deie} and \textit{seið} with \textit{<ai>} written on one occasion in \textit{saið}. LWS \textit{seede} / Anglian \textit{segede} (§123 and §123.4) is \textit{<e>} in \textit{sede} and \textit{ised}. OE \textit{æi} (Angl. Kent, \textit{<e> /e:/}) + \textit{ʒ}/\textit{j}/ (§124.1 and §125.4) is \textit{<æi>} in \textit{mæi} and \textit{græi} with \textit{<ei>} in \textit{meie} and \textit{<e>} in \textit{(i)segm}. OE \textit{æi} + \textit{ʒ}/\textit{j}/ (§124.1 and §126.4) is \textit{<æi>} in \textit{æiðer} and \textit{<ai>} in \textit{aiðer}. OE \textit{æ} + \textit{ʒ}/\textit{j}/ (§127.1 and §127.5) is \textit{<ei>} in \textit{eie, eisilche, pei} and \textit{peies} with \textit{<e>} in \textit{pegen} and \textit{<œi>} in \textit{œie}. OE \textit{æ} + \textit{ʒ}/\textit{j}/ (§128ff and §129.4) is \textit{<ei>} in \textit{leie} and \textit{<e>} in \textit{for-pregem}. OE \textit{œæ} + \textit{ʒ}/\textit{j}/ (§128ff and §130.1) is \textit{<e>} in \textit{egen/ège} and \textit{raketeege}. OE \textit{æ} + \textit{h} (\textit{g}) (§132.1 and §132.2) is \textit{<ah>} in \textit{fah} and \textit{ah}. OE \textit{œæ} + \textit{h} (§132.1 and §133.4) is \textit{<e>} in \textit{tehte} and \textit{ehte} and \textit{<a>} in \textit{ahute}. OE \textit{œ} + \textit{h} (§134.1 and §134.5) is always \textit{<o>} in \textit{un-boht, bi-boht, brohte} etc. OE \textit{a} + \textit{ʃ}/\textit{i} (§136.1 and §136.5) is \textit{<a> in dragan/dragen, laghe, lage} and \textit{lage-liese}. OE \textit{æ} + \textit{ʃ}/\textit{i} (§137.1 and §137.5) is \textit{<a>} (a WML feature in this text, see §69) before \textit{<e>} in \textit{mage/maghe} and \textit{age(n)}. OE \textit{æ} + \textit{w} (§138.1 and §138.5) is \textit{<a>} (WML, see §69) before \textit{w} in \textit{icnape, blapeð, saple} etc., with \textit{<au>} written in \textit{saule} and \textit{<o>} before \textit{p} in \textit{mopen}. OE \textit{œo} + \textit{w} (§139.1 and §139.5) is \textit{<eo>} (WM/Southern form cf. §108.1) before \textit{w} in \textit{reope and seopen} and \textit{<u>} in \textit{rupen}; the \textit{ɪ}-umlaut is WS \textit{<u>} (§109.1) in \textit{untripnesse}. OE \textit{œæ} + \textit{w} (§140.1 and §140.5) is \textit{<æa>} in \textit{feape}, \textit{<æe>} in \textit{fepe} and \textit{<ie>} in \textit{fiepe}. 
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The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:

Ich ðem elder þen ich þes. ðapintre and a lore
Ich þælde more þanne ic dude. mí þit ah to ben more
Þel lange ic habbe child ðeon. á þeorde 7 eca a dede
Þeþ ic þeoþ æapintre eald. tu þýng i eom a þæde
Vn nut lif ic habb ðilød. 7 ḳyet me þincðic ic lêde
Þianne ic me þi þenche. þel sore ic me adrede
Mest al þat ic habbe yðon. yþ heðelnesse and chilce.
Þel late ic habbe me þi þoht. but me god do milce.
Feþe þyðele pord ic habbe iquedem. sýððen ic speke cuþþe
And fæ þunge dede ido. þe me of þinchet nûþe
Al to lôme ic habbe a gult. a þeþorch þe 7 ec a þorde
Al to muchel ic habbe isþpend. to litel þþ leid an hórde
Mest al þet me lícþe æþ. þu hit me þis lícþet
Þe mýþe þolþþ þis þþ þil. þim sþfne he þi þpikeð
Ich miþte habbe bet idon. þadde þic þþ þþ þelfþþþe
Nu ic þolþþ ac þic ne þei. for elde ne for unþþþþþþe
Ýþde me þþ
Ne scolde nanman don á furst. ne slapen pel to done.
for mani man bi hateð pél. þe hit forgítset sone
De man de siker pule beon to habbe godes blisse
do pel himsulf þe hpile he mei. ðen haueð hé mid ippisse
Des riche men peneð beo siker. þurh palle end þurh diche
he deð his á sikere stede. þe sent to heueneriche
For ðer ne ðierf beon óf dréd. óf fure ne óf þeoue
þer ne mei hí bi níme. ðe læde ne ðe leoue

f. 65r
þar ne þærfe hí habbe kare óf ðýfe ne óf childe
þuder þe sendet 7 sulf bereð. to lîte 7 to sélde
þider þe scolden dragan 7 don. pél oft 7 pel ȝe lome
For þer ne scéal me us naht bi níme. mid françise dome
þider þe scolden georne dragen. polde ȝe me ileue
for ðere ne mei hit bi nímen eop þe king ne se ðreœue
þet betste þet þe hedde. þudder þe scoldle sende
For þer þe hit mihte finde ðêtfl. 7 habbæ bute ende
þe ðe hér deð eni gód. for habbe godes are
eal he hit scéal finde ðer. 7 hundred fealde more
þe ðe ehte pile healden pél. þe hpile he mei his pælden
þiue his for godes luue. þenne deð hé his pél ihealden
þre isþinch 7 ure tilde. is oft ípunede to spinden
ac ðêt þe doð for godes luue. ðêt þe hit sculen ðafinden
Ne scéal nan uuel beon un bóhte. ne nan gód un for golde
uuel þe sende al to michel. 7 gód lesse þenne þe scolde
þe ðe mest deð nu to gode. 7 ðe þe lêtes to ladh
tiuer to lîtet 7 to michel scéal dînche ðêt him bade
þer me scéal ure þeorkes þegen. be foren heue kinge
7 gíueu us ure spinches liéen æfter ure earninge
Eure èlc man mid þan þe haueð mei bigge heueriche
þe ðe mare hefð 7 ðe þe lesse. bade mei ilitating
Ealse mid his penie. se ðe oðer mid his punde
þet his ð punder lukeste pare. ðe ænimane æoure funde
And þe ðe mare ne mei dón. mid his god ipanke
eal se pel se ðe haueð goldes feale marke

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
37 æfurst 38 wél, hit 40 hé, mid 42 ásiker, þe 43 of, dréd, of, of 44 hi, binime 45 hé, of, of 46 sèlde
47 wè, wèl 48 binime, françise 49 wè, ileue 50 bi nímen, ireue 51 wèl, wèl 52 ðêt 53 hér, gód 54 hit
55 wèl 56 hé, pél 57 oft, ípuned 58 pél, ðêt, ðe, ðafinden 59 bóhte, gód 60 gód 61 lést 62 him 64 lién
65 Eure èlc 69 dón, his

37 Ne[.]N very faint but still legible 41 ðe[.]b[.]b[.] is an enlarged coloured capital which fills four lines 43 For[.]F has been placed in the left hand margin because of the descender of ð[.]b[.] [line 41] 44 mið mei: words separated by two strokes above and below
47 þider[.] þ should be a rubricated majuscule as it begins a couplet 48 For[.]F is rubricated when it should be indented 50 eop foll. by a letter eras. 51 pe[.] over eras., causing the ð and e to be spaced further apart than usual and linked with joining strokes
52 For[.]F should not be a rubricated majuscule as it does not begin a couplet 54 hundred fealde[.] ed of hundred has been squeezed onto the line prec. fealde; a break between the two words is indicated by two vertical lines above and below the line

420
And oft 'god' kan mare þanc ðan ðe hím ðiuet lesse
eal his peorke ðis þe þies is milce ðrihtpisnesse
Lite lác is gode leof. ðe cumeð of gode ipille
7 ðo letet muchel ðiuæ ðenne ðe heorte is ðille
Heuene 7 eorð he oue[r] sihð. his égen beoð spo brique ðate 75
Sunne. mone. dei. 7 fur. bið þustræ to þeane æ his lihte
Nis him naht for hole. ni hurd. spa michel bið his mihte
nis hit na spå dur'næ idon. næ aspa þustræ nihte
Hé þat 'hpæt' ðed. 7 ðenchet. ealle quike pihte
nis na hlauord spilc se is crist. na king spilch ure drihte
Heouene 7 eorðe. 7 eal þet is. bi loken in his hande
he deð eal þet his pille is. ápeteræ and á lande
He makedes fisces in dé s. 7 fugeles in dé luft
he þit 7 pealdæ ealle ðing. 7 hé scop ealle þe sceafe
He is ord abuten ord. 7 ende abuten ende
hé ane is éure en elche stede. þende þer þu þende
He is buuen us 7 bi neodæn. bi foren 7 bi hinde
þæ ðe gode pille deð. eider he mei him finde
Elche rune hé ihurð. 7 he pat ealle deede
he þurh sihð ealches mannes danc. þhet sceal us to rede
þæ þe brekæd gode hæse. 7 gultet spa ðilome
hpæt scule þe seggæ oðer don. æt ðe mucheæ dome
ða ða luueden unriht. 7 uuæl líf ledde
hpæt scule hi seggæ oðer dón. ðer engles beoð of dreedde
Hpæt scule þe ðeræn bi foren. mid hpan scule pe þepæman
þæ þe næure gód ne duden. þæ heuenliche démen
Þer scule beon deoþæs spa uèle. ðæ pullæd us for þrege

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
71 öft, him, giæt 72 hiæ, hisæ, is, 73 lác, of, 74 giæt 75 égen 77 húð 78 spá, idon, né 79 Hé, þátt 80 in, spilch
82 in, ápeteræ, alande 83 né 84 þit, é 86 hë 88 him 89 hé 91 héæ 92 wé 93 líf 94 hiæ, dón 95 pé, bërem
96 pé, gód, démen 97 uèle 98 hiæ, of, hiæ 99 pé, mís dude, hër 100 pé, pé, þæ, ibèt, pére 101 þipæte, pé 102 pé, péren, þuere
103 ðó, spilcæne 104 þó, ðicætæ 105 hpi, hì, bëgætæ, hì, þiborene 106 ðidæm 108 hís

71 god[ int. after öft 75 oue[r] sihð] almost entirely eras. 78 durenæ e int. after ð 79 hpæt] int. after þátt 81 þet] þ written
over another letter

f. 65v

f. 66r
Ne mei him na man eal spa pel demen ne spa rihte
for nán ni cnapaθ him spa pel bute ane drihte
Elc man pát him sulf bètst. his peorch 7 his ipille
he ðe lest pát he sealð ðefe mest. ðe ðe hit pát eal. is stille
Nis nan pitnesse eal se muchel. se mannes æge heorte
hpá se segge þet hé beo hál. him self þat bètst his smeorte
Elc man sceal him sulf demen. to dieðe. ðeð to liue
þe pitnesse of his peorc. to ðeð ðis. him sceal drìue
Eal ðet eure elc man hafð idó. suðde he com to manne
spilc hit si abóc ipritten. he sceal idenche ðenne
Ac drihte ne demðo nanne man. ðefter his bi ginnige
ac al his lif sceal ‘beo’ spich. se buð his endinge
Ac gíf ðe ende is uuel. eal hit is uuel. 7 gód gíf gód is þenne
god ȝyue þet ure ende beo gód. 7 þit þet he us lenne
þe man þe nele dó na gód. ne neure god lif læden
ær dieð 7 dom cume. æt his dure. he mei sare ðarden

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
110 nán 111 þat, bètst, his, ipille 112 þát, ðitte, ðe, þat 114 hpá se, hé, hál. him self, þát, his 115 liue 116 of, his, drìue
117 idó 118 hit, abóc, ipritten. 119 ðefter, biginnige 120 lif, his 121 gíf, is, uuel, gód, gíf, gód, is 122 ȝyue (the y is dotted with the accent stroke added above i), gód 123 dó, lif 124 ðarden 125 hé, ðe, ðite, ilome 127 is 128 hit 129 þe, hit, ðeileð ðe 130 ‘time’, of þinchet, mis dede 131 ilomen 132 ðet 133 hpá, ðeþ, ðeþ, of, pine 134 ilusd 135 þát, hit, ðeþ, is, pine, ðineæð 136 ðete, is 137 hé 138 hé 139 ðeæð

118 ipritten i is written long like a j 120 beo 121 Ac ða has been written to the left of the area ruled to house it 125 [þ]-t Þ ill. faded 127 [þ]-nenæ Þ ill. faded ne int. 128 don na mare do is written in the main hand; the rest is completed in another hand with t in mare corrected from n 129 [þ]-h þeðer Þ ill. faded 130 ‘time’ int. after philce 131 [þ]-eðer Þ ill. faded 133 [þ]-anæ man J ill. faded 135 [þ]-anutæ L ill. faded 137 [þ]-edde H ill. faded 139 [þ]-et Þ ill. faded

**** **** 7 þu **** hi þanne þu hi ne miht | do **** . for þi he is sot *** *** *** *** þabbe | godes are is added to the bottom margin, to follow on from 151, in the same hand that makes the additions to 128. A transcription has been attempted here, but the text is mostly erased and difficult to read. These two lines are present in the main text of E, T and D. M has the first line and a variant of the second. J has variants of both of these lines. L does not have these lines.

f. 66v
[þ]et hé ne muge ðenne bidde ðare for hit itít ilome
ði he is pis ðe beot 7 beat. 7 bit be foren dome
[þ]en’ne/ deað is æt his dure. pel late he biddeð are
pel late he letede uuel peorc. þe hit ne mei don na mare
[þ]eh þeðer þet hit ðeileð ðe. for drihte sulf hit sede.
a þilc ‘time’ se eure ðe man of þinchet his mis dede
[O]ðer later ðeðer raðe milce he sceal ðiomen
dc ðe þe naðo naht ibet. pel muchel he sceal beten
[M]ani man seid. hpá ðeþc of pine. ðe sceal hæbbe ende
ne bidde ich na bet beo ilusd. a domesdei of bende
[L]utel þat hé hpé is pine. 7 litel he ðineæð
þhpilc héte is ðer saule puneð. hu biter pinde þer blæðed
[H]edde hé ibeon ðær anne dei. ðeðer tpa bare tide
nolde hé for æl middan eard. ðe þridde þere abide
[þ]et habbet izeð þe come ðanne. þet piste mid ipisse
for to ðe muchele murcðe cume. ðis murhðe mid ipisse
Ich pullu nu cumen éft to ðe dome. ðe ich eop ðe sede
on ðe deie 7 át ðe dome. us helpe crist 7 rede
ðer ðe magen beon ðeð ðe of drede. 7 herde us ádrede.
ðer elch seal seon him bi foren. his pod 7 ec his dede
Eal seal beon ðer ðenne cuð. þet man luþen hér 7 stelen
eal seal beon ðer unþrigen. þet men þrigen her 7 helen
Þe sculen ealre manne líf icnapay. eal spa ðe aðen
der sculen evenýnges beon ðe heþe 7 lagen
Ne seal þeh nan scaniam ðer. ne ðearf he him ádrede
ðif him her ðe þincð his gult. 7 bet his misdede
For heom ne scanet ne gramet. ðe scule beon iborðeþe
ac þe oðre habbet scame 7 grame 7 ðeer fele sorþe
ðe dom seal sone beon idon. ni lest he napiht lange
ne seal him nan me ne mene ðer ðe strendðe ne ðe ðe ðange
þa sculen habbe herde dóþe. þe here þere hearde
þe uuelle heolde precche men. 7 uuelle làghe arerde
End éfter þet hé hauet idon. seal ðer beon idemed
blðe mei hé ðenne beon. þe god háfðe pel icþemay
Eælþe da þe isþrungen beðð of adam 7 ðe ðue
ealle hi sculen ðuíðer cume. for ðode þe hit ilene
Þa ðe habbed pel ðidon. éfter þeþore mihte
to heþenriche scule faren forð mid ðear dreþte
Þa ðe nábbedgod íðon. 7 ðer inne beðð ifundy
hi sculen falle spíðe ráðe in to helle grunde

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
141 pine 142 ðrunke, ðmeng, ðine 143 is, of 144 hi, biðð, giðð, spéore 145 of 146 of, nát, hu, ðine 147 his, ðafande
148 þere, þif 149 inne, ðat, ðine 150 ðine 151 þere, þoreld þeþe 153 éft, ofþ 154 deþ, åt 155 of drede, ádrede 157 hér
159 liþ, icþanay 160 evenýnges 162 giðð of þincð 165 ðidon 166 ofþ, ðof 167 ðóm 169 éfter þet, hé, ðidon, idemed 170 hé, ðafð, icþeþay 171: ðof, ðof 172 ðé 173 ðidon, éfter 175 þiþe, ðidon, ifundy 176 spíðe
The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:

203 prêche] c has been subj. after c. 204 [pe] iot. after pé. 211 [Mare] M is so faded that it is difficult to determine. 213 [ipis] i is i-longa.
The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:

214 is, lies 215 his 216 hís, béd 217 hé, pines 218 á 220 pêle, inne 221 pise 222 hi, hit, prite 224 gið 226 of 228 hère 229 pôp, éche, strête 230 hi, ‘hête’ 231 hête 231 hête 252 hi, éft, of 253 pâ, inoh 254 ipisse 255 Hi, éure, ác, imete 237 Hí 239 pis, pére, hér, ádanke 240 be hêten, áht 241 góð 242 hér 243 is, pich, éure 244 úuel, líf 245 ðer 247 is, éure, hit, naphít 248 hér 249 pére, of

The text, written in the same hand, has been squeezed into the right margin immediately after lines 214–216; some of the text has been lost through crop, and has been reconstructed here 222 me] int. after [þer 225 Under stæd] Û is enlarged and coloured with a depth of two lines 230 hête] int. after fram 233 lisse] prec. by b eras. 234 ipisse] the i is long like a j 242 hpet] p written over h 248 preche] c written over r

ac helle king is ar lies. pið da þe he mei binde
De þe deð his pille mest [he] | haueð [perse] | m[ede] 215
his beð scal beo peallende pich. his bêd. burnende glede
þurse hé deð his gode pines. þenne his fullfe feonde
god sculde ealle godes frund. á pið spiche freonde
Neure an helle ic ne com. ne cume ic ðer ne recche
ðeh ich æches poruld þele. ðer inne mihte fecche 220
þeh ich pulle seggen eop. þet þise men us sede
7 awoke hi hit prite. þer ‘me’ mei hit rede
Ich hit pulle segge þam. þe him sulft hit nusten.
7 þarnie heom pið þeora unfreme. gið hi me pulle hlusten
Under stædnu to me. þedi men 7 earme 225
Ich pule telle of helle pine. 7 parine eop pið hearme.
On helle is hunger 7 ðurst. uæle þpa ifere
þas pine dolið þa þe þere mete niofges hère
Þer is panunge 7 póp. etter éche strête
hi fareð fram ‘hête’ to chele. fram chele to hete 230
þenne hi beoð in ðe hête. þe cheleþeoð blisse
þenne hi cumedé ðft to chele. of hete hi habbed misse
Aider heom died þá ínoh. nabet hý nan lísse

nuten þfeðer him deð þurs mid nan líppese
Hí palked éure 7 sechod reste. ác hi ne múgen ímeteor þi ði nolden hpile hi mihten heore sunne bete
Hí sechet reste ðer nan is. þi ne múgen hi finde
ac palked peri up 7 dun. se peter deð mid pinde
Þis beoð þa ðe père hér. áðanke unstededefeste
7 to gode be hétan áht. 7 nóld hit ileste 240
Þá þe góð peorc bigunne. 7 ful endien hit nóld
nu peren hér. 7 nóde ðer. 7 nuste hpet ho polde
Þere is pícch þe äure paelð. þer scule báðie ínne
þa þe ledde úuel líf. in feoth end in íginne
Þér is fur þe is hundred fealde hattre ðen ure
ne mei hit cpenche salt peter. nauene striem ne sture
Þis is þet fur þe ðuíre burnð. ne mei hit naphít cpenche
hér inne beoð þe þes to leof. precce men to spenche
Þa ðe père spichele men. 7 ful of uæle prenche
The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:

- 255 pi̇ int. after mannes
- 263 untrupnesse
- 266 te] int. after ūet
- 267 li̇f
- 268 ƿe, of̄ drēd
- 269 ƿa, of̄ dufte
- 270 li̇f
- 271 ƿihte
- 272 ƿere
- 273 ƿíse
- 275 ƿorulde
- 276 ƿihte
- 280 ƿihte
- 281 is] foll. by two letters eras.
The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:

| 288 há, pinne | 289 þe, pere | 290 of, of² | 291 há | 292 hére | 293 hí, á | 294 hi, út | 295 ibede | 296 áre | 297 éch, hé, of, pi ne | 298 hí | 299 þe, de | 301 Lete, pí | 302 pí, hé, hít; pí | 304 ém cristen | 305 raet | 306 hit | 307 nipe | 308 þa, háfó, hí | 309 há, spá, ofte | 310 for, hit, is, liht, is | 311 hé, giue, pí | 312 of | 313 pí, éfter, píle | 314 on | 315 of, pé³ | 316 béo, pé, spá, of | 317 pí, pé², erminges | 318 pí, héuene, hére | 319 Né, hí | 322 pí, ofte |

---

The following words have an enlarged and coloured letter; this probably follows from the error in the previous line, where the initial letter is mistakenly enlarged and coloured. It is most likely caused by the line opening with the same word as the line that precedes it. A should be an enlarged and coloured letter; this probably follows from the error in the previous line, where the initial letter is mistakenly enlarged and coloured. It is most likely caused by the line opening with the same word as the line that precedes it.
Pe scolden ealle us biðenche ófte. 7 pé ilome
hpét pé beoð to þán pé scule. 7 óf hpán pé come.
Hú little hpile pé beoð hér. hú lange elle’s’ hpáre
hpét pé mugæ habben hér. 7 hpét finde þere
Gief pé þere pise men. ðis pé scold eðenche
bute pé purðe us iper. ðeós poruld pule us for drenche
Mest ealle men he gíueð drinchæ. ðof ane deofles scenche
hæ sceal him cumne sculde pél. gíf hí híne nele scenche
ne 337 Ga
ƿ
no longer visible
Mig. ealmihtiges godes luue. ute pé us bi perien
pið ðises precches poreldæ luue. þet hæ mage usderien
Mid festen ælmes 7 ibede. perie pé us pið sunne
Mid ða þepne ðe god haueð. þígæþen man cumne
Lete pé þe brade strét. 7 ðene péi bene
þe let þet nigeðe dél to helle ðoþe of manne. 7 ma ich þene
Ga pé ðene næræpe ne. 7 ðene péi grene
der forð fareð litel folic. ac hit is feir 7 scéne
þe brade strét is ure ipill. ðe is us lað to forlætæ
þæ ðe eal folgæð his ipill. fareð bi ðusse strætære
Hi muðen lihtlætæ gæn mid ðere under huðle

f. 70v
ðurh ane godliðæ eode ‘into’ ane bare felde
[B]e nærepei is godes hése. þer fórð fareð pél fiæpe
þet beoð þa ðe heom sculdeð géorne pið æche un ðæpe
[B]as gæð uniðeæ ðæanes ðe clúæ æge æan þe heage huðle
dæ letæð eal heore ægen pill. for godes hése to fulle
[G]a pé alle þene pei. for he us pule bringe
 mid te ðæpe feire men. be fonen heuen kinge
[B]er is ealre mürhœd mest. mid engleæne sænge
ðæ is æþæænd pintre þè. ne ðincð him naht to lange
[B]e ðe lest haueð hafð spæ michel þet hæ ne bit namare
þæ ða blisse. for þæs forlæt hit him mei reope sare
[N]e mei naen ugel ne napæne beon inne godes riche
ðer þæ beoð punungenæ feæ. æch oðer unilæche
Sume ðer habbeð lessæ mürhœðæ. 7 sume habbeð mare
æfter ðæ ðæ dædæ hér. æfter ðæn þæ þæ þæ spæcæ sare
[N]e sceal þer beon ne bried ne þæn. ne oðer cumnes este

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels – this folio is very faded and it is possible that some of the strokes are no longer visible:
323 pé, oath, peł 324 hpét, pé, phæn, pé, of, phæn, pé 325 Hú, hpile, pé, hér, hú, elle’s’ hpáre 326 hpét, pé, hér, hpét 327 gief, péð 328 pé, iper 329 gíueð, of 330 hæ, pé, hí, híne 331 æ 346 pé 384 biðten 335 Lete, pé, strét 336 dél, of, pé ne 337 Ga, pé 338 scéne 339 bæ, strét, ipill, þæ, forlætæ 340 þæ ðæ, his, ipill, stræte 341 hí, gán 343 is, hése, pé 344 pé orne, æche 345 uniðeæ, clúæ 346 pill, hése 347 pé 350 is 351 hése 352 for lét, hit 356 hér 357 þæn, este

Nearly all of the initial letters on this folio are so faint that they are impossible to read or are absent altogether. I have included them in the following notes conjecturally.
325 elles hpáre| int. after elle 331 Þæd| M is an enlarged coloured capital which fills two lines 334 Þæd| M is incorrectly enlarged and coloured 342 pole| 0 is difficult to read because of a hole in the folio into int. after pole 343 [þæ] Þ ill. faded 345 [þæ] Þ ill. faded 347 [þæ] Þ ill. faded 349 [þæ] Þ ill. faded 351 [þæ] Þ ill. faded 353 [þæ] Þ ill. faded 355 Sume| is very faint and difficult to read 357 [þæ] N ill. faded
god ane sceal beo eche lif. 7 blisse. 7 éche reste
[N]e sceal ðer beo fah ne grei. ne kuning ne `er mine
ne aquerne. ne martes cheole. ne beuer né sabeline
360
[N]e sceal ðer beo sciet ne scrud. ne poruld þele nane
eal þe murhðe þe me us bi hat. al hit sceal beo god ane
[N]e mei na murhðe. beo spa muchel. se is godes sihte
365
[h]e is soð sunne 7 briht. 7 dei àbuten nihte
[H]e is ælches godes ful. nis him na pið uten
na god nis him þane þe þunieº him abuten
[Þ]er is þele ábute gane. 7 reste abuten spinche
þe mei 7 nele ðider cume. sare hit him sceal óf ðìnche
London, British Library
MS Egerton 613,
folios 7r–12v
Transcription of London, British Library MS Egerton 613, fols. 7r-12r

MS Pointing: E1 has irregular pointing. The punctus, when used, is normally found mid-line but is more often absent. These occurrences of pointing, which are represented in the text, will not be listed in the notes. However, other instances of punctuation are noted below. A punctus can be found after: sunne, mone and dai: line 76; be γit: line 126; Purst, hunger, chule, hete and eche: line 199; sic: 201; hordom: 255; pine 288; chele and þurst: line 323; bed: line 328; faste and almesse: line 337; haueð: line 355; blisse: line 362; and purse: line 392.

Capitalization is regular at the beginning of each couplet – with each of the initial letters being enlarged and coloured. The initial letters alternate in colour between red and green: the first new couplet on the folio always beginning with a red capital, except at 11v where the order is reversed. These occurrences will be shown in the text but not referred to in the accompanying notes, apart from when demonstrating something exceptional. Most initial letters of a couplet are contained within the writing grid of their own line, with exceptions being noted by line number.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

Throughout the text þ has been expanded to þet at lines: 114, 161, 225, 282, 292, 319, 348 and 392\(^{(x2)}\). There are only two occasions where þet is written out, and they are at lines: 122 and 268.

i queme expanded to i quemen: line 95; heo expanded to heom: lines 228, 303, 323, 348; mupe expanded to mupen: line 323; cune expanded to cunne: line 334; and no expanded to non: lines 357 and 367.
Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

Both of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* within Egerton contain strong South-Western linguistic features, as evidenced below. Laing (LAEME) believes the language of both versions is of south-west Worcestershire with the text of E1 possibly being more northern.\(^{849}\) Both texts, which were copied from the same exemplar, retain archaic grammar and orthography, with the scribe of E2 being more conservative than the scribe of E1.\(^{850}\)

E1 more often writes the runic letter <Ƿ> (*þorn*) in initial position(§ 2.5): þænne, þanne, þech, þinh etc., with occasional occurrences of <ð> (§ 3.2): ðæn, ðenne, ðe etc. In medial position <Ƿ> is usual(§ 4.5): iqueue, cupe, nupe etc. with occasional <ð> (§ 4.5): syðen, laðe, bæðe. In final position it is mostly <ð> (§ 4.5): bispikð, buð, sendð etc., with rare <Ƿ> (§ 4.5): folgþ, beþþþ and beþþþþ. The only occurrence of <þh> (§ 5) in E1 is in sathanas, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 Remark). E1 writes <h> for <Ƿ>/<ð> on two occasions in þinh and hafh (§ 6.2) and, conversely, <ð> is written where <h> might normally be expected once only in purð: this might be a scribal error for þ or, alternatively might be a genuine variant form of this word (§ 6.3). The graph <ð> being written for <þ> is a regular feature of the writing in E1 (§ 7.4): mỳs liked, bi hoted, haued etc. There are also frequent occurrences of the dental stop /t/ written for <þ>/<Ƿ> in low stress positions (§ 8 and § 8.3): þincthet, det, pillet, habbet etc. The double fricative[ðð] is simplified in syðen (§ 10.3).

The runic letter <ƿ> (*wynn*) is retained throughout E1 with only one example of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.6) found in wilde. The Old English letter ligature <æ> is occasionally found in E1 (§ 12.2): æm, þænne, þæs etc. E1 writes the Tironian nota <þ> (§ 13.1) throughout this text, with and being written occasionally (*sixteen times*)(§ 13.5).

---


\(^{850}\) In addition to the examples provided here, see Hill, ‘Notes on the Egerton e Text’, pp. 353–357.
Insular ȝ is retained in E1 alongside Caroline g (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): gramet, grunde, glede etc. and before the OE back-vowels a, o, u (§ 42.2): god, gulde, gon etc. and by levelling in (bi)ginninge. The movement to <w> is present in about half of the occurrences for the fricative /j/: drapen, hope, moupe (§ 43.9) - with the remainder retaining <ȝ> (§ 43.8): in muge, aȝen, lages etc. E1 preserves <ȝ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): gung, guet, for gut etc. Initial <ȝ> is retained before i in gif (§ 45.4) but writes <g> in Gif (see Comment to § 45.4). E1 demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in for-preien and ne-i-seien with <ȝ> retained in egen, pegen and segen (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement iȝ > i (§ 48) in ani, mani and æidi is further demonstrated in E1. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before d (§ 49) in sede and ised (§ 49.5). Late OE /dz/, written <cz>, is written with Frankish <gg> in biggen, seggen, ligget etc (§ 50). The OE group nȝ /ŋ/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.16 and § 51.18): lange/longe, king, strengbe etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/, written <nc>, before <f> in strench (§ 51.17). The OE prefix ge is retained on four occasions in E1 in ge-lad, ge-spynch/ge-spinch, ge-lome (§ 57).

In initial position < ço for /k/ is retained before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in cupe, cudde, cunne etc. with <k> only found in king(e)/kinges. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written as < ço in cunig, can, comeð etc. but <k> is found in kare and kan. Before <n> (§ 18) E1 retains < ço in cnapad/(i)copeð and (i)napen as it is before all other consonants (§ 19) in (i)-clepede, cliue, criste etc. E1 writes <qu> (§ 20) for OE cw in i-queþen, quike, aquenche etc. E1 writes <k> in medial position for OE velar c throughout the text: (§ 21 and § 21.5): speke(n), likede, sklakien etc. with rare occurrences of < ço (§ 22 and § 22.5) found only in: brecoð and the compound godcunnesse (god + cunnesse) and <ch> (§ 25 and § 25.4) on one occasion in perche.
However, <c> is always retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.5): ac, ec, pance etc. with no
evidence of <k>.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in E1 is <ch> (§. 27, §. 28.5, §. 29.5 and §. 30.5): child(e), chilce,
muchel(e), smeche, elch, æfrech etc and in pinchen (§. 32 and §. 32.17) and penche (§. 32 and
§. 32.19) etc. with <c> /tʃ/ (§. 31 and §. 31.5) the usual form in ic. However, the occasional
writing of <c> in elc/eure-ic, spilc, spulc and pilc are possible variants with /k/ (§. 31.5). E1 also
writes <c>, probable /k/, in þincð (§. 32.1 and §. 32.18), <k> in smeke and <ck> in recke where
palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at §. 33 and §. 33.5).

E1 mostly writes <sc> (§. 35.5) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: scal, scirreve, scop etc.
with <s> (§. 36.4) written in sæl, sulle, solde and solden. In medial position /ʃ/ is <ss> in fisses
(§. 38). OE [ts] is always written <c> in milce (§. 41).

E1 writes OE unvoiced [ʃ] as <f> in initial position (§ 58 and § 58.17) in fele, folgep, for etc.
in all instances except three: vуйe, vele and (i)-vere. In final position <f> is retained in lyf, of, self
(§ 58.18) etc. and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: himsulfne, oft/otfe, after
(§ 58.18) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.19) through the writing of
<v>/<w> between vowels or other voiced sounds in himselue, vuel, aljue etc. with some instances of
<f> still retained: be-fore(n)/bi-foren, a-life, pife/pýfe etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before d
in hadde (§58.20).

In E1 OE a in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): habbe, fared, bапien etc. and <a> before
a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.5) in man, banke, banne etc. Before a lengthening group, OE a is mostly
<a> (§ 61 and § 61.5) in longe, strong(e), honde etc. but <a> in lange, hanged and prange. E1
mostly writes <a> for OE æ (§ 63 and § 63.5): habit, almesse, after etc. with the occasional
writing of WML <e> and <ea> still found in ener, pet/hpet, peder, sed and beað. OE e is nearly
always <e> in E1 (§ 64 and § 64.8): beren, ende, felde, strenge/strencpe etc., with <ie> written in biende. OE o is always written <o> in E1 (§ 65.1 and § 65.7): before, bode, borde etc. E1: OE i is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.13) in bidde, child(e), finde(n) etc. with <y> written in ge-spynch (§ 66.13) and occasional <u> in pule, pulle, pulled (see § 66.4 for the influence of w), osprung and nuten and nuste(n) (probable WML form, see § 66.6 and § 66.14) and <e> in nele and nelle (§ 66.14 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to ê). For OE y, E1 has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.13), a feature of WML texts: dude, gulte, muchel(e) etc. However, there are significant number of writings of <i/y> also present: pinche(n), kinge(s), spile etc. and <e> in deden, euel(e), a-ferst and lest. OE y (§ 67.15) is <u> in lutel, hud, fur(e), cupe and cudde, with <i> in litel and hpi. E1 retains <u> for OE u (§ 68 and § 68.5) throughout the text: punien, grunde, sune etc., except in the writing of the verb come(n), comeð etc. where the usual form is with later <o>.

In E1 there is more evidence of <o> for OE ā, as a result of neutralization, than in E2 (§ 69ff and § 69.7): lore, one, non etc. with <a> still found irregularly in anne, nanne-mon, hatere etc. In E1 OE ā is mostly written <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): dede, rede, adrede etc., however, <a> (§ 75.1) is regularly written in vnisalp, adrade, of-drad/of-drard and naddren, with <ia> (§ 75.5) in liache and <ea> (§ 75.6) in un-sealpe (for OE þer see § 77ff). OE ā is mostly written as <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) mest, un-helpe, lest etc. with <æ> (§ 79.2) written in ær and æfrich, <ae> written in ær and <ea> (§ 72.1 and § 79.8); however, the writing of <a> (§ 79.3) is regularly found in E1: ar, ani, ge-lad, ladde and lat (for ælc, e lc and ylc see § 81ff). OE ê is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.5): he, dep/ded/det/deð, i-que me etc. OE ë is almost always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.7): mi, hpile/hpyl/pile, abit etc. with <u> written in spunes (§ 83.2). OE ë is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.5): to, dom(e), boc/boke etc. OE u is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.5): nv/nu, ure/vre, bu etc.
In E1 OE ea (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r*, without lengthening (§ 88.14), is regularly <e>:

arge, sparte, narepe and bars with traditional <ea> (§ 87.5 and § 88.1) found in earme and <e> in bars; before *rd* (§ 88.15) it is more regularly <e> in herde and (midden)erd with <ea> also written in (midden)erd and <a> in hard; before *rn* (§ 88.16) <a> is written in parnen and parnie with <e> found in erninge. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.8) in derne and smerte. OE ea before *l*, without lengthening (Anglian a), is mostly <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.8): al and alle, falle, salt etc., however, <ea> (§ 90.3) is written in ealle and eal(mihtes) and peald; before *ld* there is some variance, with the writing of <ea> (§ 91.2 and § 91.7) regular in pealded, eald(e), healde(n) etc. and <æ> in selde, <e> in selden and felde and <a> in palt and halt. For the *i*-umlaut of ea before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of a) E1 writes mostly <e> in elder /eldre and elde (§ 92ff and § 92.8) but has SW <u> in ulde. OE ea before *h* combinations is <e> in hege and shows transition to the front glide sound, written <ei> (§ 87.3, § 93.2 and § 93.7) in heie, heige and sei. The *i*-umlaut of ea before *h*-combinations is always <i>/<y> in myhte/mihte(n) and nihte(s) (§ 94.1 and § 94.6).

For OE eo before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.7) E1 writes smoothed <e> in perche/perc and perkes but <eo> (a form retained longest in the WML and the South § 96.1 and § 96.2) is retained in peorkes, heorte and steorre. The wur group (§ 97 and § 97.7) is <u> in purpe and for the *i*-umlaut of eo it is <u> in purst and purs(e) (see note to § 97.7). OE eo before *l*-combinations is <e> (§ 98ff and § 98.8) in selue, self and suelf, with <i> in sief (see § 98.2) and SW <u> in sulfne/sulne. OE eo before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.6) in rihtgisnesse, vniht, rihtte and briht and britte and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.8) in ouer-sibô and purô-sibô. OE – WS eom is æm and eom (SW form § 101). OE eo (a-umlaut of e) is mostly <e> in E1 (§ 102ff and § 103.5): fele/vele, brekeð and pele with <ea> in feale (possibly by association with the antonym fêawe, see § 103.5). OE eo (u-umlaut of e) is regularly <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.5) in heune and heuenliche etc. with <e> written in porld and porules/porlds and <u> written under the influence of w in suster and
pude. The velar umlaut /o of /i (§ 105ff) is regularly written <e> in E1 (§ 105.8): bi-nepen, suefer, 
henne etc., alongside <i> in (be)-nimen and quike; however, <eo> (WML and SW form) is found in 
heore and seouene/seoue with <u> (WML and SW form) in hure and the writing of syðen and 
sutpe/suðpe reflecting a lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW (IWS syðlan, § 105.3).

In E1 OE ēa (§ 106ff and § 106.7) is mostly written as <e>: ec, eþe, deþe etc. but <ie> (see 
§ 106.2) is regularly found in dieþe/died, unieþe and as <ye> in lyen and <æi> in æidi. The /-
umlaut of ēa (§ 107.1 and § 107.6) is nearly always SW <u> (see § 107.1) in i-hurd, ihuren, a-luesd 
and iluuet with <e> only written in rhyming position (see § 107.1), therefore, an unlikely 
representation of the dialect, in ileued, ileue and temen. E1 retains <eo, o, ue and u>, forms associated 
with the South and WML (§ 108.1), alongside unrounded <e>: beo/beo, seon, freond etc., buen and 
bue, bu and buþ, bo and frond alongside ben/be, isen, leure etc., with <i> in lif and sic. The /-umlaut 
of ēo (§ 109 ff) is a mixture of <e> and <u> (§ 109.7): frend, fend and nede, and <u>, possibly from 
WS y (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /œ/ from ēo, in pustre, pusternesse, durlinges with 
<o> in dore and <ue> in duere (both also associated with the South and WML) and <e> in nede.

In E1 OE ea after sc (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.6) is mostly <æ>: scal, scamien, scamet and 
scame, with <æ> in scæl/sæl, <ea> in sceal and <e> in sceft and sced (<e> is possibly as a result of 
its position between palatal and dental consonants). For the /-umlaut of ea after c (§ 113.6) E1 
writes <e> in chele and bi-cherd but SW <u> (see § 113.1) in chule. OE ēa after g (§ 114) is <e> in 
ger. For OE ie after g (§ 116.5) E1 mostly writes SW <i>/<y> (§ 115.1) and forgytet, gýue, gýued etc 
with <u> for-gut and gúue and <ie> in gieued (both also likely SW forms). Similarly, for OE ie after 
g E1 writes SW <ue> in guet and SW <u> in gut with <e> in get (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE ie after 
sc (§ 118.5) E1 writes SW <u> in sculde and sculdeþ and <i> in scilde(n). OE eo after g (§ 119.1 and
§120.5 is <u> in ʃung, <ui> in ʃu̯inge and <eo> in ʃeŋger and ʃeʊgede (see § 119.1). OE ø after sc (§ 121.5) is written as either <u> in scuʃle(n)/sculen/sculled or <o> in solde(n)/scolde(n) and scop.

OE æ + ʒ /j/ is mostly <ai> in E1 (§ 122.1 and § 122.6) in mai and dai with occurrences of <ei> (WML) written in mei. seйт/seid. LWS sæde / Anglian sægede (§ 123 and §123.5) is <e> in sede and ised. OE æʃ(Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + ʒʃ/ (§ 124.1 and §125.5) is <i> in mei/meiȝ, grei and seie with <e> written in segen. OE æʃ + ʒʃ/ (§ 124.1 and §126.5) is <e> in eie, eisliche, pei and peies with <e> in pegen. OE ɛ + ʒʃ/ (§ 128ff and §129.5) is <ei> in for-preien and leie. OE ɛa + ʒʃ/ (§ 128ff and §130.5) is <e> in raketeie and <e> in egem. OE ə + h (g) (§132.1 and §132.2) is <a> in ah, with the glide sound /u/, written <ou>, present in fou. OE æʃ + ʒʃ/ (§ 132.1 and §133.5) is <e> in ethe and <ei> before c in eicte: the glide sound /u/, written <au> is present in both auht and tauhte. OE ø + h (§ 134.1 and § 134.6) in E1 almost always demonstrates the glide sound /u/, written <ou>, in vn-bout, bi-pohte, brouthe, broutte etc. with <o> written before h once in bi-þoht. OE a + /y/ (§ 136.1 and §136.6) is <a> in lage but the regular form demonstrates the movement to /au/, written <aw>, in drapen, lape and lape-lese. OE æ + /y/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.6) is mostly <o>, written before y, in moge and oge but demonstrating the movement to /au/, written <ow>, in hope/ope/open and with the glide sound written <ou> before p in moupe: however, <a> (a WML feature in this text, see § 69) is also found before y in age and before p in apene. OE æ + w (§ 138.1 and §138.6) is <o> before w in mopen, with the <ou> combination present in soule and before w in bloupet; however, <a> before w is also present in icnape(n) and cnaped. OE ɛo + w (§ 139.1 and § 139.6) is <eo> (WM/Southern form cf. § 108.1) before w in seopen, <u> in rupen and <eu> (§ 139.1) in reupe: the i-umlaut is <eu> in untreunesse. OE ɛa + w (§ 140.1 and §140.6) is <e> in fepe and <eu> in feupe.
Ic æm elder þænne ic þas. a pinter and a lore
ic þælde more þænne ic þude. mi pit ah to ben more
Pel lange ic habbe child iben. a porde 7 ec a dede
þech ic beo a pintre eald. to ðung ic eom at rede
Vnvnpt lyf ic habbe þe lad. 7 guet me þin þic lede
þænne ic me bi þanche. pel sore ic me adrede
Mest al þat ic habbe þedon þis idelnesse and childe
pel late ic habbe me bi þoht. bute me god do milce
Fele þydele þorc ic habbe i þe þeþen syðen ic speke cuþe
and fele ðuþinge deden i do þat me of þinchet nuþe
Al to lome ic habbe a gult a þorde. mi þit ah to ben more
ðæl lange ic habbe child iben. a þorde
Vnvnpt lyf ic habbe þe lad. eal þæl þæl lede
þæl me of þinchet nuþe
þæl me bi þoht. bute me god do milce
Fele þydele þorc ic habbe i þe þeþen syðen ic speke cuþe
and fele ðuþinge deden i do þat me of þinchet nuþe
Al to lome ic habbe a gult a þorde. mi þit ah to ben more
ðæl lange ic habbe child iben. a þorde
For þer ne þarf he ben of drad of fure ne of þe v'e
þer ne mai it þyrm bi nimen þe loþe ne þe leue
þer ne þarf he habbe kare of piue ne of childe 45
þider þe sended suel and bred to lutel and to selde
þider þe solden drapen and don þel oft 7 þel ge lome
for þer ne scal me us nout binimen mid pronge ne mid þoþe
þider þe scolde þerne drapen 7 don polde þe me ileue
for þer ne mai þ'hit' ou bi nimen þe king ne þe scirreve
Al þat beste þat þe habbet þider þe scolde sende
for þer þe it mupen finden eft 7 habben abuten ende
þe þe her det ani god for to habben godes ore
al he it scal vinden þer. 7 hundred felde more
þe þe ehte pile healden pel þe pile he mai his pelden
þiue his for godes lueue eft heo hit scullen a vinden
þre ispinche 7 ure tilpe is ofte ipuneþ to spinden
ac þat þe dot for godes lueue eft þe it scullen a vinden
Ne scal non vuþel þen bout ne non god þen for golde
vuþel þe doþ al to muchel 7 god lasse þanne þe scolde
þe þe mest deþ nu to gode 7 þe þe lest to laðe
aþþer to lutel 7 to muchel scal þinchent eft þyrm baðe
þer me scal vre perkes þegen bi foren þen heuene kinge
7 þiuen us ure spinches ðýen after vre erninge
Eure ilc man mid þàn þe he haueð mai biggen heueriche
þe þe more haueð 7 þe þe lasse. boþe mai iliche

f. 8r

He alse mid his penie se þe oþer mid his punde
þat is þe þunder likeste þære þat eni man eure funde
And þe þe more ne mai don bute mid his gode þanke
al se pel se þe haueð goldeþe feale manke 70
And god can more þanc ðan þe him þiueð lesse
al his perkes 7 his peies is milce 7 ritgifnesse
Lutel loc is gode leþ þat comed of gode pille
7 eð lete muchel þyue þenne þe heorte is ille
Heuene 7 erþe he ouer siþð. his egen beð so britte
sunne. mone. dai. 7 fur bud þustre to þenes his lihtte
Nis him nout for hole ni hud so muchel bet his mihte
nis it no so derne i don. ne a spa þustre nihte
He þot pat deþ 7 þenchet alle quike þihte
nis no louerd spilc se is crist. na king spilc vre drihte
Heuene 7 herþe 7 al þat is be loken in his honde
he ded al þat þis pilles is a patere 7 a londe 80

43 þeþeþe u is subp. after eþ with v int. 50 hitþe int. after mai 52 endeþe d has a pen flourish from the ascender
56 eft þeo hit scullen a vindenþe scribe is mistaken in his transcription of the second half of this line. It would appear that his mistake is caused by an eþ-skip to the ending of line 58. The end of line 56 should be healden (or a form thereof) to rhyme with pelden (Line 55): see notes in parallel texts (see p. ) 67 midþe d has a pen flourish from the ascender 68 eftþe s has a pen flourish from the ascender
71 þancþe foll. by ð subp.; this is the initial letter of the following word 80 louerdþe d written over
He makede fissey inne þe see 7 fugesles inne þe loftef
he pit 7 palt alle þing 7 he scop alle scetfes
He is ord abouten orde 7 ende abouten ende
he one e eure on elche stede pende par þu pende
He is buuen vs þi næpen bi foren 7 bi hinde
þe þe godes pille þe eider he mai him finde
Elche rune he i hurd 7 he pot alle dede
he purði siði elches mannes þanc pat scal us to rede
þe þe brekeð godes hese 7 gultet so ilome
pet sulle hi seggen ðoper don. at þe muchel dome
þo þe luueden vnriht 7 vuel lif ladde
pat scullen he seggen ðoper don þar engles bed of dreddde
Hpat sculle þe beren bi foren us mid þan sculle þe him i quemen
þe þe neure god ne duden þe heueneliche demen
þer sculle ben deofles spo fele þe pulled us for preien
nabet þi noþing for þyte of al þat hi ere segeñ
Al þat þe mis duden her hit pullet cüþ þere
buten þe habben it ibet þe pile þe h'yer þere
Al hi habbet an here i prite þat þe mis duden here
þei þe it nusten ne i seien hi peren vre i fere
Hpet scullen horlinges do. þe spikele þe for sporene
pi spo fele beod i cleped spa feupe beod i corene
þi hpi þere he bi þyte to þan þere hi i borene
þe sculle ben to deþe i demd 7 eure mo for lorene
Elch man scal him sulne þar bi clepiean 7 ec demen
his age perc 7 his þanc to þitnesce he scal temen
Ne mai hým na man al spa pel demen ne al sa rithte
for nan ni cnaped him spa pel buten one dritte
Elc man pot him sulue best his perc 7 his i pille
þe þe lest pot seft ofte mest 7 þe þe it pot is stille
Nis no þitnesse al so muchel so mannes hope heorte
hpa 'se' segge þet þe beo al him self þat best his smerte
Elc man scal him suel demen. to deþe ðoper to liue
þe þitnesse of his ope þperc to ðoper ðis him scal drieue
Eal þat eure iic man haued i do stþe he come to manne
spilc hit seie on boc ibraten. he scal it þenche þanne
Ac drit'h'te ne demed nanne man after his bi ginninge
ac his lif scal beo spulc se bued his endinge
Ac gíf þe ende is euel al it is uuul 7. al god gíf god is ende
god ðuuue þat ure ende beo god. 7 pite þet he us lend tho
þe man þe nele do no god ne neure god liif leden
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aer ded 7 dom come to his dure he mai sore a dreden
þat he ne mupe þenne bidde ore. for it itit ilome
þi he is pis þe bit. 7 be git. 7 bet be fore dome
þenne ded is ate dure. pel late he biddet ore
þel late he leted vuel peorc. þe hit ne mai do na mare
Sunne let þe 7 þu naht hire þanne þus ne miht do no more
for þi he is sot þe spa abit to habbe godes hore
þeh þe þat þe ilome 125
þi he is þis þe bit. þe hit ne mai þe dure. þwel late he biddet ore
þwel late he leted vuel peorc. þe hit ne mai do na mare
Mani man seid po recke of pine þe scal habben ende
ne bidde ic no bet beo a lused a domesdai of bende
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Lutel þat he hþat is pine 7 lutel he it icþoped
þilc hete is þer soule punet hu biter pind her bloupet
Hadde he ibeon þer anne dai. oþer tpa bare tide
nolde he for al middan eard. þe þridde þer abide
þat habbet ised þat comen þanne þit þuste mid ipisse
uuel is pine seoue þer for seoue nihtes blisse
And ure blisse þe ende hañh. for endeliese pine
betre is pori þater to drinke þenne atter i meng mid pine
Spinues brede is spuþe spete so is of wilde dere
ac al to duere he i buþhed. þat giued þere fore his spere
þul pome mai liht liche speken of hunger 7 of fasten
spa mai of pine þe naht not. hu hi scullen ilesten
Hadde he ifonded sume hþile. he polde al seggen oþer
eð late him þere pif. 7 þchiþd. suster. 7 fader. 7 broþer
Al he polde oþerluker don 7 oþerluker þenche
ganhe be bi þouhte on helle fur þe nophiht ne mai aquenche
euere he polde inne þa her. 7 inne pine þunien
þid þan þe mihtte helle pine bi fluen 7 bi scunien
Eð lete him þere al þoruldes pele. 7 al eordliche
for to þe muchele murcð cume þat is heuenriche
I pulle nu comen eft to þe dome þat ic eop er of sede
on þat dai 7 at þe dome. us helpe crist 7 rede
þper þe þagen þeone eðe of drad 7 harde us adrade
þer ele scal i seo bi þore him. his þord 7 ec his dede
þal scal ben þanne cud. þet man lugen her 7 stelen
Al scal ben þer vnprien. þat men þruþen her 7 helen
þe scullen alre manne lif icnaþe þer al so vre oþe
þer sculle heueninges ben þe heige þe louge
Ne scal þe ne manne þenæ þer. ne þerf he him adrede
gif him here of þinchet his gult. 7 beted his misdede
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For heom ne scamet ne ne gramet þe sculle beon iboruƿene
ac þe oþre habbet scame 7 grame þat sculle beon forlorene
Þe dom scal sone ben idon. ne last he nopit longe
ne scal him noman mene þer of strengþe ne of prange
Po scullen habbe hardne dom. þe here peren herde
þþ þa þe euele heolden þreche men 7 vuele lages rerde

Ac after þan þe he haued idon. he scal þer beon idemed
þliþe mai he þanne buen. þe god haued iquemed
Alle þo þat isprunge þeð of adam 7 of eue
Ealle he sculle þuder come. for þoþ þe it ileued
Po þe habbed þel idon. after heore mihte
to heuenriche he scullen. ford mid ure drehte
Po þe nabbed god idon. 7 þer inne þeð ifunde
he sculle falle þiþe þaþ þe in to helle grunde
Þar inne he scullen þunie buten ore 7 ende
ne brecð neureueft crist helle dure to lese hem of bende
Nis no sellic þei heom beo po. 7 hem beo vneþe
nele neuerit crist þolie deð. for lesen heom of dieþe
Enes drihte helle brac. his frend he ut broutte
him self he þolede dieð for hom. þel dore he us bouhte
Nolde it moupe don for meþ. ne suster for broþer
nolde it sune don for fader. ne noman for oþer
Ure lauerd for his þreles. ipined þas on rode
ure bends he unbond. 7 bouht us mid his blode
þe þieueð vneþe for his luue astiche of vre brede
ne þenche þe þat he scal deme þo þiþe to dede
Muchele luue he us cudde. þolde þe it understonde
þat vre eldrene mis duden þe habbet vuele an honde
Dieð com in þis middenerd. þurh þe ealde deofles onde
7 sýnne 7 sorgþe 7 þei spinche. a þatere 7 ec alonde
Vres formes faderes gult. þe abigget alle
al his of sprung after þým in herme is bi falle
Þurst. 7 þunger. chule. 7 hete. eche. 7 al unelps
þurh dieð com in þis middenerd. 7 oþer vnisalþe
Niere no man elles died. ne sic. ne non vn þysele
ac mihten libbe eure mo a blisse 7 on hele
Lutel iþenclið mani man hu muchel pes þe sýnne
for þan þoliþd alle died þe comen of here cumne
Here sýnne' 7 ec vre open. sore us mai of þinche

For in sýnne þe libbet alle in sorepõen 7 in spinche
Suðþe god nam þa mucheþe þreche for aene misdede
pe þat so muchel 7 spa oft mis doð muȝen vs sore adrede
Adam 7 his of spring for one bare sunne
pas fele hundred pintre in helle in pine 7 in vnpunne
And þo þe leded here lif mid vnrht 7 mid pronge
bute it godes milce do sculle beo þer pel longe
Godes psidom is pel muchel. 7 al spa is his mihte
7 nis his milce napith lasse. ac bi ðes ilke pihate
More he one mai for þiuen. þenne alfole gulte cunne
Deofel suelf mihte habbe milce. gif he it bidde gunne
þe ðe godes milce sechð. ipis he mai is finde
ac helle king is oreles. pið þa þe he mai binde
þe ðe deð his pille mest. he haued purst mede
his be'âð scal beo pallinde pich. his bed berninde glede
Purs he deð his gode pines. þene his fulle feonde
god sculde alle godes frend a piht scuche freonnde
Neure on helle ic ne com ne comen ic þer ne reche
dëh ich elches purldes pele. þer inne mihte fecche
þeh ic pulle seggen eop þet pise men us sede
and aboke it is i prite. þer me mai it rede
Ic it pulle sege hoom þe hem self it nusten
7 parnen heom pit heore hearme. gif hi me pulled lusten
Vunderstondet nu to me. aði men 7 earme
Ic pulle telle of helle pine. 7 parnie op pið herme
On helle is vnrger 7 þerst. vuele tuo ifere
þos pine þolied þo. þe pere mete nibinges here
Þor is poninge 7 pop after eche strete
hi fared fram hete to þe chele. fram chele to þe hete
Þanne hi beod in þe hete. þe chele ðinchet blisse
þenne hi comed ëft to chele. of hete hi habbed misse
Aþer hem deð þa inou. nabbit ‘h’i none lisse
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nuoten hi þeper heom ded purst. mid neure non ipisse
Hi palked eure 7 sechet reste. ac hi ne muȝen imeten
for þi hi nolden þo pile hi mithten here sunne beten
Hi seched reste þer non nis. ac þi ne mupen ifinde
ac palked peri up 7 dun. al se þater deð mid pinde
þis beod þo þe peren her. on þonke vn stedefaste
7 þo god bi heten auht. 7 nolden it ilaste
þo ðe god peorc bi gunne. 7 ful enden hit nolden
þe peren her 7 nuþe þer. 7 nusten þet he polden
þere is pich þat eure pealð. þat sculle baþien inne
þo þe ladde vuel lif. in feoh end in iginne
Þer is fur þat eure barnð. ne mai hit napiht quenche her inne beod þe pes to lef. precche men to spenche 250
Þer is fur þat is undredfelde hatere þanne beo vre ne mai it quenchen salt pater. nauene strien ne sture
Þo þe pere spikele men. 7 fulle of vuela þrenche þo þe ne mihte euel don. 7 don lef pas it to þenche 255
Þo þe luueden reuing 7 stale. hordom. 7 drunke 7 þe on þes deofles þorke blifeliche spunke
Þo þe pere so lease. þat me hi ne mihte ileuen med þeorne domes men. 7 þrançise reuhen 260
Þe oþre mannes þif þes lif. his æpene eð lete
7 þo þe suenegede muchel. on drunke 7 on ete
Þe precchen bi nemen hure ehte. 7 leiden huere on horde þe lutel leten of godes bode. 7 of godes porde 265
And of his open nold ȝiuen. þer he sei þe nede ne nolde ihuren godes sonde þer he sette his beode
Þo þe peren oþeres mannes þinc. leure þanne it scolde 7 peren al to gredi. of suelfer 7 of golde
And þo þe vntreunesse deden. ȝam hi ahhte ben holde 7 leten þat hi scolde don. 7 duden þet hi polde
Þo þe ðýsceres peren of þis þoruldes ehte 270 f. 11r
7 dude þat þe loþe gost. hem tihte 7 ec tauhte
And alle þo ðen eni pise. deoslen her iquemde þo beoð nu mid him an helle for don 7 for dempde
Bute þo þe ofþouhte sore. her here mis deden 7 gunnen huere gultes beten. 7 betere lif leden 275
Þeor beð naddren 7 snaken. eueten 7 frude
þa tered 7 freteð þe uuele speken. þe nihtfulle 7 þe prute
Neure sunne þer ne scinð. ne mone ne steorre þer is muchel godes hete. 7 muchel godes ȝeorre
Eure þer is vuela smech. þusternesse 7 eie
nis þer neure oþer liht. þanne þe sparle leie 280
Þer ligget laðliche fend. in stronge raketeie þet buð þe þe pere mid gode. on heuene pel heie
Þer buð ateliche fend. 7 eisliche pihte þos sculle þa precchen i son. þe sueneg þurð sihte
Þer is þe loþe sathanas. 7 belsebuc þe ealde 285
Leþe he muþen ben of drard. þe hine sculled bi helde
Ne mai non heorte it þenche. ne no tunge ne can telle hu muchele pine. 7 hu vele. senden inne helle
Of þo pine þe þere bued. nelle ic hou nout leioðen nis it buþe ganen 7 gleo. al þat man mai here dreoðen
Ac þet ne deð heom nout so þo. in þo loþe biende 290
bute  þat hi ‘piteð’ þet heore pine. ne scal neure habben ende
þer buð þo heþenemen. þe þere lape lese
þe heom nas nout of godes bode. ne of godes hese
Vuele cristenenem. hi bud here i vere
þo þe heore cristen dom. vuele heolden here
Gut hi bud a purse stede. on þere helle grunde
ne sculle hi neure comen vp. for marke ne for punde
Ne maþ heom noþer helpen þer. i bede ne almesse
for nis noþer inne helle. ore ne forgiuenesse
Sculde him elc man þe pile he mai. of þos helle pine
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And þarnie æc his frend þer þid. so ic ‘habbe’ mine
þo þe scilden heom ne cunnen. ic heom pulle teache
ich kan beo gif i scal. lichame 7 soule liache
Lete þe þat god for bet. alle mancunne
7 do þe þat he us hat. 7 scilde þe us pid sunne
Luuie þe god mid vre heorte. 7 mid al vre mihte
7 ure emcristene alse us suelf. spa us lerde drihte
Al þat me rat 7 singð. be fore godes borde
al it hanged 7 bi halt. bi þisse þam porde
Alle godes lape þe fulð. þe neþe 7 þe ealde
he þe þos tpa luue haued. 7 pel hi pule healde
Ac hi buð þunder erued helde. spa ofte þe gulted alle
for it is strong to stonde longe. 7 liht it is to falle
Ac drihte crist he þiue us strencþe. stonde þat þe mote
7 of alle vre gultes unne us come bote
Pe pilned efter porldes pele. þe longe ne mai ileste
7 leggeð al ure ispinch. on þinge un stede faste
Sspunch þe for godes luue. half þet þe doð for elhte
ne þere þe nout spa bi cherd. ne spa vuele bi cauhte
Gif þe serdeðen god. so þe doð erninges
more þe haueden of heuene. þanne eorles ðer kinges
Ne muþen hi her þerien heom pid chele. pid þurst. ne þid hunger
ne þid elde ne þid deð. þe eldre ne þe þeonger
Ac þer nis hunger ne þurst ne deð. ne unhelþe ne elde
of þisse riche þe þenchet oft. 7 of þere to selde
Pe scolden alle us bi þenche oft 7 pel ilome
hpet þe beð. 7 to þan þe sculle. 7 of þan þe come
Hu lutel pile þe beð her. hu longe elles pare
hpæt þe muþen habben her. 7 hpæt elles hpare
Gif þe þere þise men. þis þe scolden þenche
bute þe þurþe þe ƿale þe pule for drenche
Mest alle men he þiueð drink. of one deofles scenche
he scel him cunne sculde pel. ƿif he him nele scrench
Mid ealmhites godes luue. vte pe us bi perien
pid þes preches porldes luue. þat he ne mape us derien
Mid fasten. 7 almesse. 7 ibede þerie pe us pid sunne
mid þo pepnen þe god haued þuuen alle mancunne
Late pe þe brode streth. 7 þe pei bene
þe lat þe niȝeðe del to helle of manne. 7 mo ic þene
Go pe þene narepe þei. 7 þene þei grene
þer forð fareð lutel folc. ac it is feir 7 scene
þe brode streth is vre ipil þe is us lod for to leten
þe þe al foleped his pil. fareð bi þusse strete
Hi mupen lihtliche gon. mid þere nuðer hulde
ðurh ane godliese pude. in to ane bare felde
þe nareþei is godes þes þer forð farð þel feuþe
þet bûð ða þe heom sculde þeorne. þid elche un þeape
ðos goð un iþe þo þeþanes þe cluþe æþean þe heþe hulde
þos leted þal þere æþen pil. for godes hese to fulle
Go pe þale þene þei. for þe us pulle bringe
mid þo faire feþe men. be foren heuene kinge
þer is alre meruþe mest. mid englenc songe
þe þis a þuþen ת pintre þer. ne þîncð him noht to longe
þe þe lest haued. haued so muchel þat he ne bit no more
þe þe blisse for þos for lat. it þim mai þreuþe sore
Ne mai non vnel ne non pane. beon inne godes riche
deh þer þeþ þe þuþenþes þele. elc ðeþer vn iliche
Sume þer habbet lasse murhðe. 7 sume habbed more
after þan þe þi dide þer. after þan þe þi þonke sore
Ne scal þer ben bred ne þin. ne þeþer cunnes est
þe god one scal beo eche lif. 7 blisse. 7 eche reste
Ne scal þer beo fou ne grei. ne þeþer cunig ne ermine
ne ocþuerne ne martes cheole. ne þeþer ne þabeline
Ne scal þer beo sced ne scrud. ne þorþel þeþe none
al þe murhðe þe me us bi hat. al it scal beo god one
Ne mai non murhðe beo so muchel. so is godes sihte
þe is soð sunne 7 briht. 7 dai a þuten nihte

He is elches godes ful. nis him nþeping ȝit vten
no god nis him pane. þe þuþed him abuten
þer is þeþe abute grame. 7 rede abutene þrinche
þe mai 7 nele þider come. sore it þim scal ofþrinche
þer is þlisse abuten treþe. 7 lif abuten þeþe
þe eure scullen þunien þer. þliþe mupen ben eþe
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Per is geogeðe bute ulde. 7 hele abuten vn helðe
nis þer so're'pe ne sor. ne neure nan vn sealþe
Per me scal drihte sulf i seon. spa he is mid ipisse
he one mai 7 scal al beo. engle 7 manne blisse
And þeh ne beod heore ege naht. alle ilege brihte
di nabdæ hi nouht ilege. alle of godes lihte
On þisse 'liue' hi neren nout. alle of one mihte
ne þer ne scullen hi habben god. alle bi ore gihte
Po scullen more of him seon. þe luuede him her more
7 more icnapen 7 ipiten. his mihtæ 7 his ore
On him hi scullen ñïnden al þat man mai to lestæ
hali boc hi sculle iseon. al þat hi her nustæ
Crist scal one beon inou. alle his durlinges
he one is mœchele mare 7 betere. þanne alle ðæter þinges
Inoh he haued þe hine haued. þe alle þing pealed
of him to sene nis no sed. ðel h'e'm is þe hine bi healdeð
God is so mere 7 spa muchel. in his godcunnesse
þet al þet is 7 al þat þes is purse. þenne he 7 lesse
Ne mai it neure no man ðæter segge mid ipisse
hu mucheæ murhœ habbet þo. þe beod inne godes blisse
To þere blisse us bringæ god. þe rixlet abuten ende
þenne he vre soule vnbind. of licames bende
Crist gœue us leden her spilæ lif. 7 habben her spilæ ende
þat þe moten þuder come. panne þe hene pendæ. ameN
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MS Pointing:

The text of J has regular pointing. Punctus are written at the end of each line and half line and are not noted in the apparatus. However, instances when the punctus is missing or in other circumstances of use are listed below. The scribe of J also regularly writes the punctus elevatus: instances of this are shown in the text but not noted below unless they do not occur at the end of the line or half-line.

A punctus is present after the following words in neither an end-line or half-line position: elde: line 17; childe: line 25; wiue: line 26; þarf: line 44; þefte: line 46; king: line 51; poure: line 68; werkes: line 71; sunne, mone and heuene: line 75; nowhiht: line 76; þenchep: line 78; king: line 79; eorpe and is: line 80; watere: line 81; þyrshyp: line 89; swiken: line 103; bi cleopien: line 107; iwis: line 109; vuel: line 121; bet: line 126; bet: line 136; hunger: line 151; pyne: line 152; crist, fader and suster: line 154; strengþe: line 170; sunne, sorewe and watere: line 194; hunger and hete: line 197; seorewe: line 204; kynge: line 216; tele: line 219; boke: line 220; her: line 240; pych: line 241; strém: line 244; reving and hordom: line 249; drunken: line 254; by nymeþ: line 255; sat: line 259; seoluer: line 261; fordun: line 268; neddren: line 271; mone: line 273; pyne: line 284; marke: line 294; euen cristen: line 304; newe: line 307; half: line 315; deþ: line 321; beþ: line 324; festen: line 333; folke: line 336; þeo: line 342; mureþe: line 349; konynge: line 357; oter: line 358; sunne: line 362;

The punctus is not present, where it would be expected, after: wes: line 1; for þete: line 35; weþen: line 64; her: line 237; by gunne: line 239; gost: line 266; men: line 346; wone: line 351;
Capitalization occurs frequently at the beginning of lines; these occurrences will be indicated in the text but not in the accompanying notes. Capitalization in the middle of the line will also be shown in the text but not in the notes. Enlarged and coloured capitals occur at the beginning of some lines, often at six-line intervals. These will be indicated in bold in the text but not in the notes.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

ponsor has been expanded to pat at lines: 123, 166, 177, 272, 278\textsuperscript{1}, 280, 288, 299 and 354\textsuperscript{3}, but is mostly written out as pat: 7, 10, 13, 23, 24 etc. On two occasionssponsor has been expanded to per: 138 and 163, but is mostly written out as per: 44, 49, 51, 53, 55 etc.

i has been expanded to in: line 42, 198, 264, 268, 278, 284 and 384; loud expanded to louerd: line 79 and 187; neu expanded to neuer: line 93, 123, 142, 143, 182, 232, 294 and 370; mones expanded to monnes: line 114; eu expanded to euer: lines 117, 132, 152, 158, 200, 233, 241 and 245; grimlyc expanded to grimlych: line 141; sume expanded to summe: line 153; leue expanded to leuere: line 260; mo expanded to mon: line 286 and 383; heo expanded to heom: line 287; cist expanded to crist: line 311; Am expanded to Amen: 388 and 390.
Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

The language of this manuscript is West Midland and the text shares many of the forms found in the “AB” dialect, as evidenced below, and also in Lambeth. Samuels locates the manuscript, specifically, to ‘South-East Herefordshire, just north of Ross near the Worcestershire border’\textsuperscript{851} with the LALME also believing a Herefordshire dialect is probable.\textsuperscript{852}

The graph $<\delta>$ does not occur at all in J where it is always written $<\p>$ (§ 1, § 2.6, § 3.3 and § 4.6), except for very rare $<\text{th}>$ (§ 5) in sathanas, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 Remark) and once for medial $<\text{t}>$ in euethen. The graph $<\delta>$ is written for $<\text{d}>$ once only in lodliche (§ 7.6), a reading shared with both E2 and M. The writing of $<\text{t}>$ for $<\p>$ in 7 te demonstrates assimilation of $\p$ (§ 8 and § 8.4).

J always writes $<\text{w}>$ (§ 11.1), with the runic letter $<\text{ƿ}>$ (wynn) only found once in porie. J writes $<\text{vv}>$ for $<\text{w}>$ in Vve on three occasions (§ 11.8), always at the beginning of a line. J mostly writes and (122 times) throughout this text with the Tironian nota $<\text{Ʌ}>$ written 68 times (§ 13.1).

Insular $\text{ʃ}/\text{ʒ}$ is not present at all in the writings of J (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position is established as $<\text{g}>$ before a consonant (§ 42.1): grimmých, grunde, grýsliche etc.and before the OE back-vowels a, o, u (§ 42.2): god, agulte, go etc. and by levelling in (b)gýnnýnge (§ 42.3). The movement to $<\text{w}>$ has been completed in J, which writes $<\text{w}>$ for the fricative /ɭ/ throughout the text (§ 43.10): folweþ, mowe, owe etc. J writes $<\text{γ}>$ for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1) throughout the text: yong, yet, for-ȝet etc. but writes plosive /g/ $<\text{g}>$ in vn-for-gulde (see § 45.3 and Comment) Initial $<\text{γ}>$ is usually omitted in if (§ 45.4) but is found once in ȳef. J is the only text which demonstrates transition to a palatal in all examples (§ 47ff): ȳen,
weyen, for-preye etc. The continuation of the OE movement ǐȝ > ǐ (§ 48), written ọy, in eny, mony and edye is further demonstrated in J. Palatal j /j/ is vocalized to /i/ before <d> (§ 49) in seyde, seide and seyden – a probable Anglian feature (§ 49.6). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cʒ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in bugge, seggen, legge etc. The OE group ng /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.19 and § 51.21): longe, kinge, yong, wrongwise etc. with devoicing to /ŋ/ before <d> in meynd (§ 51.5).

In initial position /k/ is nearly always written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in king(e)/kyng, ikud, kunne etc. but it is <c> in cupe. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written <c> in con, cupe, cucep etc. but <k> is found in konyng and kunne(n). Before <n> (§ 18) it is <k> in knowep and (i)knowe and before other consonants (§ 19) it is always <c> in (i)clepede, (bi)-cleopen, criste etc. J writes qu (§. 20) for OE cw in queme, quyeke, quench etc. J writes <k> in medial position for OE velar c throughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.6): eke, werke, spaken etc. with no occurrences of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.6). J also writes <k> in final position (§. 24 and §. 24.1), the only text of the CL to regularly do so: ek, work, bonk etc. with <c> written on only one occasion (§. 23.6) in bec and <h> in ah. The writing of <h> in ah demonstrate a transition to the fricative /ax/ (§. 26 and §. 26.2) – a feature it shares with L and that is associated with the OE Anglian dialect.

J always writes <ch> for /tʃ/ (§. 27, §. 28.6, §. 29.6 and §. 30.6): child(e), chilce, muchel, riche, ich, such etc and in bushen (§. 32 and §. 32.21) and benche (§. 32 and §. 32.23) etc. with <k>, probable /k/, written in pinkp (§. 32.1 and §. 32.22) and bipenkp (§. 32.1 and §. 32.24). J also writes <k>, probable /k/, in smoke, rekp and (i)swyn(e) where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at §. 33 and §. 33.6).
J nearly always writes <sch> (§ 37.3) for /ʃ/ (§ 34) in initial position: schal, schirreue, schop etc., with only one exception, <sc> (§ 35.6) is found in scolden. In medial position /ʃ/ is <ss> in fýsses (§ 38). OE [ts] is always written <c> in mýlce (§ 41).

J mostly writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position (§ 58 and § 58.21) in ful, feole, foleweþ etc., however, vocalization is regularly demonstrated through the writing of <v> in veole, vor, virst etc (§ 58.21). In final position <f> is retained in of, lif, seolf (§ 58.22) etc. and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: eft, after, lufte (§ 58.22) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.23) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in him-seolue, heude, bivoren etc. with only two instances where <f> is still retained: bi-fore and deofles (§ 58.23) etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before d in hedde (§ 58.24).

In J OE ā in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): habbe, vare, naueþ etc. but before a nasal there is evidence of West Midland /ɔ/, written <o> (§ 60 and § 60.6) in mon, mony, bonk etc. alongside a limited writing of <a> in mannes and ban/bane. Before a lengthening group, OE ā is always <o> (§ 61 and § 61.6): longe, wronge, honde etc. J mostly writes <a> for OE æ (§ 63 and § 63.6): habbe, almes/almesse, after etc. with the occasional writing of WML <e> still found in heude, hedde, brek and hweþer. OE e is almost always <e> in J (§ 64 and § 64.9): beren, ende, strengbe etc. with the writing of <eo> in seollich a result of WS syllic. OE o is almost always written <o> in D (§ 65.1 and § 65.8): bi-fore, bode, borde etc. with the writing of <eo> in seorrewe influenced by OE soerȝean (Jordan § 35: Remark 3). J: OE i is regularly <i>/<ʏ> (§ 66ff and § 66.15. The writing of ʏ in J is orthographical rather than phonological) in biden, child(e). fýnde etc. with occasional <u> in osprung and nule, nulle and nuste(n) (a probable feature of the AB dialect see § 66.16). For OE y, J has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.15), a feature of WML texts: dude, punchen, agult etc. with regular <i>/<ʏ> writings also present: pinche, a-virst, king(e)/kýng. OE ʏ is
always <u> in lutel/lutle, ihud. fur(e), cupe and cudde, with <i> only present only once in hpi. Despite the later date of J, in comparison nearly all the other MSS, <u> is nearly always written for OE u (§ 68 and § 68.6): cume(n), punien, grunde etc., with <o> only present once in sone.

J writes <o> for OE ā, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.9): lore, one, non etc. with rare <e> found in namore, aquerne, bihat (cont.), hatture and hat (cont.). In J OE æ is always written as <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): dede, rede, adrede etc (for OE þær see § 77ff). OE æ is nearly always written <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) mest, vnhelhpe, lest etc. with <ea> (§ 72.1 and § 79.8) written in teache and rare <a> (§ 79.4) written in ilad and lat (for Ælc, elc and ylc see § 81ff). OE ë is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.6): he, queme, ibet etc (the writing of doð is by analogy and the fem. heo is written for masc., see § 82.6). OE ï is always <i>/<y> (§ 83.1 and § 83.8): myð, briste, hwile/hwil etc. OE Ï is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.1): to, dome, boke etc. OE u is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): nu, ure/vre, þu etc.

In J OE ea (§ 86 and §87ff) before r, without lengthening, is mostly <e> (§ 88.1 and § 88.17): þarf, arme, swarte and narewe, with <e> found once in erewe; before rd (§ 88.18) <e> is written in harde but <e> in (middel)erd/mýddeled; before m (§ 88.19) <e> is written in warný/parný with traditional <ea> found in earnýnge. The ï-umlaut of ea before r-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.9) in derne and with <ea> found in earnýnges. OE ea before l (Anglian a), without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.9): al and alle, fallæ, walæs etc. before ld the writing of <o> (see § 91.1 and § 91.8) has become regular in wolde, old, folde etc. with <e> found in welde and weldep and <a> in hald. For the ï-umlaut of ea before l-combinations (Angl. mutation of a) J has <e> in eldref/eldure and elde (§ 92ff and § 92.9) but writes <ea> in ealde. OE ea before h combinations shows transition to the front glide sound, written <eþ> (§ 87.3, § 93.2 and § 93.8), in heþe and iseþh. The ï-umlaut of ea before h-combinations is always <y>/<i> in mýhte(n)/míhte and nýhte(s) (§ 94.1 and § 94.7).
For OE eo before r-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.8) J writes <e> in werke and werkes with late evidence of <eo> (WML) found in heorte and steorre. The wur group (§ 97 and § 97.8) is <u> in wurbe and for the i-umlaut of eo it is <u> in wurse (see note to § 97.8). OE eo before l-combinations is <eo> (Angl. § 98ff and §98.9) in seolf/seolue. OE eo before ht is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.7) in ryhtwisnesse, vnrht/vnriht, ryte and briht(e) and <i> for the i-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.9) in ouer-syhp and burh-syhp. OE – WS eom is am (chiefly Angl. eam § 101). OE eo (a-umlaut of e) is regularly WML <eo> (§ 102.3 and § 102.9) in veole/ueole/feole and weole alongside rare occurrences of <e> in wele and brekeð. OE eo (u-umlaut of e) is regularly WML <eo> (§ 102.3 and § 104.6) in heouene and heoueriche etc., alongside <e> in heuenliche and <o> in world(es), with <u> written under the influence of w in suster. The velar umlaut io of i (§ 105ff) is regularly written as <eo> (WML or SW form) in J (§ 105.9): bi-cleopien, seoue, heore etc, alongside <e> in bi-neþen, icleped and seþen and <y> in (by)nyme, quyke, and nyþe.

In J OE ōa (§ 106ff and § 106.8) is nearly always written as <e>: ek/eke, eþe, deþe/deþ etc. with <ea> in lean. The i-umlaut of ōa (§ 107.1 and § 107.7) is always <e> in ileue, here, teme etc. OE ëo (§ 108ff and § 108.8) is mostly <eo>, a form associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1) alongside occasional <e>: beon, seon, leof etc. with <e> in be, þeue and sek. The i-umlaut of ëo (§ 109 ff) is always unrounded <eo> (§ 109.9), WML and Southern form (§ 109.1 and § 108) in freond, feond, þeostre etc.

In J OE ea after sc (§ 111, § 112ff and § 112.7) is always <a> in schal, scal and schafte etc. For the i-umlaut of ea after c (§ 113.7) J writes <e> in chele and bi-cherd. OE ëa after g (§ 114) is <e> in yer. For OE ie after g (§ 116.6) J always writes <e> (Anglian § 115.1): for-yet, yefte, yelde etc. Similarly, for OE ie after sc (§ 118.6) J writes <i> in schilde with <e> in scheldeþ. OE eo after g (§ 119.1 and § 120.6) is <o> in yonce and
OE æ + ʒ /j/ is nearly always <ay> in J (§122.1 and §122.7) in may and day, with <ey> written once in sey. LWS séde / Anglian seæde (§123 and §123.6) is always <ey> in séyde(n). OE æʒ(Anlg. Kent, <e>/e:/) + ʒ/j/ (§124.1 and §125.6) is <ey> in mey, grey, seyén and iseýe. OE æ2ʒ/j/ (§124.1 and §126.7) is <ey> in eýber. OE e + ʒ/j/ (§127.1 and §127.7) is <ey>/<ei> in eye, weý(e) and wei. OE e + ʒ/j/ (§128ff and §129.6) is <ey> in for-preý and leýe. OE æa + ʒ/j/ (§128ff and §130.6) is <ey> in eýen and raketeýe. OE ā + h (g) (§131.1 and §132.2) has the glide sound /u/, written <ou> in fou and <au> in auh. OE æ2 + h (§132.1 and §133.6) is <ay> in aýhte, with <a> in tahte. OE ò + h (§134.1 and §134.7) in J always demonstrates the glide sound /u/, written <ou>, in vn-bouht, bi-bouht, brouhte etc. OE a + /u/ (§136.1 and §136.7) demonstrates the movement to /au/, written <aw> in drawen, lawes and lawe-leve. OE ā + /u/ (§137.1 and §137.2) in J demonstrates the movement to /ou/, written <ow> (for the writing of <o>, see §69), in mowe and owe/owene. OE ā + w (§138.1 and §138.7) is mostly <o> before w (for the writing of <o>, see §69) in iknowe, (i)knowep and blowep, with the <ou> combination present in soule and soulen but <au> in saule. OE ò + w (§139.1 and §139.7) is <eo> (WM form cf. §108.1) before w in reowe and seowe, with <e> written in rewe; the ō-umlaut is <e> in untrewnesse. OE ēa + w (§140.1 and §140.7) is <e> in fewe.
Ich am eldere þan ich wes a winter and ek on lore.
Ich welde more þan ich dude. my wyght ahu to beo more.
wel longe ich habbe child ibeo. a werke and eke on dede.
þah ich beo of wyнтер old. to ýong ich am on rede.
vnned liif ich habbe ilad. and ýet me þink þich lede.
hwenne ich me biþpenche. ful sore ich me adrede.

Mest al þat ich habbe idon. is idelnesse and chilce.
wel late ich habbe me bi þouht. bute god do me mylce.
veole idel word ich habbe ispeke. seôþþe ich speke cuþpe.
and feole ýonge deden ido. þat me of þînche nuþe.
Al to lome ich habbe agult. on werke and on worde.
Al to muchel ich habbe i spend. to lutel i led an horde.

Bëst al þat me likede er. ny hit me mýþ lÝkeþ.
þe muchel folowe þis wil. him seolue he bi swikeþ.
Mon let þi fol lust ouer go. and eft hit þe likeþ.
Ich mýþte habbe bet i do. heuede ich enþelhþe.
Ny ich wolde and i ne maþ. for elde. ne for vnhelhþe.
Elde is me bi stolen on. er þan ich hit wiste.
Ne maþ ich bi seo me bi fore. for smoke ne for mýþte.
Erewe we beoþ to donne god. vael al to þriste.
More eþe stondeþ mon of mon. þan him to crýste.
þe wel ne dop hwile he maþ. hit schal him sore reowe.
hwenne alle men repen schule. þat heo ear seowe.
Dod to gode þat ýe muwen. þe hwile ýe beoþ alþue.
Ne lipne no mon to muchel. to childe. ne to wýue.
þe him seolue for ýet. for wiuæ. oþer for childe.
he schal cumen on vuele studæ. bute god him beo Milde.
Sendæ vch sum god bivoren him. þe hwile he maþ to heouenes.
Bëtære is on almes bi uoren. þane beoþ after seouene.
Ne beo þe leouere þan þi seolf. þi meþ ne þi mowe.
Sot is þat is oþer mannes freond. more þan his owæ.
Ne lipne no wif to hire were. ne were to his wýue.
Beo vor him seolue vÝch mon. þe hwile he beoþ alþue.
þis is þat him seolue biþenkþ þe hwile he mot libbe.

vor sone willeþ him for ýete þe fremede and þe sibbe.
þe wel nule do hwile he maþ. ne schal he hwenne he wolde.
Monþy monnes sore iswýnk. ofte habbeþ vnholde.
Ne scholde nonom don a virst. ne slakien wel to donne.
vor monþy mon biþoteþ wel. þat hit for ýeteþ sone.
þe mon þat wile syker beo. to habbe godes blýsse.
Do wel him seolf þe hwile he maþ. þenne haueþ he hit mýþd iwisse.
þeos riche men weneþ to beon sýker. þurh walles 7 þurh diche.
Ah heo dop ðeore aþhte in siker stude. þat sendeþ hit to heoue riche.
vor þer ne þarf. he beon adred. of fure ne of þeue.
þar ne may hit byynyme. þe loþe ne þe leoue. 45
Þer ne þarf he beon of dred. of þyfete. ne of yelde.
þider we sendeþ and seolþ bereþ. to lutel and to selde.
þider we schulde drawen and don. wel ofte and ilome.
Ne maþ þer non hit vs býnyme. myðd wrongwise dome.
þider we schulden drawen and don. wolde þe me ileue. 50
vor þer ne maþ hit vs bý nýme. þe king. ne þe schirreue.
Al þe beste þat we habbeþ. þider we schulde sende.
vor þer we hit myhte vinden eft. 7 habben -o- buten ende.
He þat her dop ený god. to habbe godes ore.
Al he schal výnde þer. an hundred folde more. 55
þe þat aþhte wile holde wel. þe hwile he maþ him wolde.
þeue hit for godes luue. þenne dop he hit wel iholde.
vre ðwynk 7vre týleþpe. is iwuned to swýnde.
Ah heo þat hit þeueþ for godes luue. eft hit mowen ivýnde.
Ne schal non vœl beon vn bouht. ne no god vn vor gulde. 60
Vuel we dop al to muchel. god; lasse þane we scholde.
þe þat mest dop ðv to gode. 7te þe leste to laþe.
Eyþer to lutel and to muchel. schal þunchen heom ef to bæþe.
Þer me schal vre werkes weýen bý vore heouene kinge.
And þeyen vs vre ðwynkes lean. after vre earnýnge.
65
Eþeruþþ mon mýð þat he haueþ. maþ bugþe heoueriche.
þe riche and þe poure boþe. ah nouht alle ilýþe.
þe poure. myðd his penýe. þe riche myðd his punde.
þat is þe wunderlicherste ware. þat euer was ifunde.
7 ofte god con more þonk. þe þat þueþ him lasse.
70

f. 170r
Alle his werkes. 7 his þyftes. is in rýhtwisnesse.
Lvtel lok is gode leof. þat cumeþ of gode wille.
þe lutel he let on muchel wowe. þer þe heorte is ille.
heouene 7 evþe he ouer sýþþ. his eþen beþþ so brihte.
Sunne. 7 mone. heuene. 7 fur. beþþ þeostre aþþýn his lyhte. 75
Nis him for hole nowiht. ne ihud. so muchele beþþ his myþte.
Nis no so derne dede idon. in so þeostre nyhte.
he wot hwat þencheþ. 7 hwat dop. alle quþke wþhte.
Nis no louerd such is críst. ne king. such vre drýhte.
Heouene 7 evþe. and al þat is. biloken is. in his honde. 80
he dop al þat his wille is. a wære. and eke on londe.
he makede fýsses in þe sea. and fuweles in þe lufte.
he wit and wald alle þþng. and schop all scæfte.
he wes erest of alle þþng. and euer býþ buten ende.

42 and 43 these lines have been trs. according to the letters a and b written in the margin 51 schirreue] diac. above e 62 gode]
diac. above o 72 lok] diac. above o
he is on ewiche stude. wende hwer þu wende.
he is buuen and bi nefen. bi voren vs and bi hinde.
þe þat godes wille dop. ichwer maþ him fynde.
Hvých rune he iherþ. þe wot alle dede.
he þurh sýþþ, vých monnes þonk. wy hwat schal vs to rede.
þe þat brekeþ godes hes. and gultþ so ilóme.
hwat schulle we seggen óþer don. at þe muchele dome.
þe þat luueþ vnryht. and heore lif. vuele ledeþ.
we þat neuer god ne duden. þen heueneliche demeþ.
hwat schulle seggen óþer don. þer engles heom drede.
Crist for his muchele myhtþ. hus helþ þenne and rede.
þe þat brekeþ godes hes. and gultþ so ilóme.
Hwat schulle we beren vs bivoren. Mid hwan schulle we queme.
þe schule beon deoulen so veole.
hwat schulle we bivoren. Mid hwan schulle we queme.
þe wot alle dede.
þe uþurh sþþhþ. þaþ þat brekeþ godes hes. and gultþ so ilóme.
hwat schulle we seggen óþer don. at þe muchele dome.
þe þat luueþ vnryht. and heore lif. vuele ledeþ.
we þat neuer god ne duden. þen heueneliche demeþ.
hwat schulle seggen óþer don. þer engles heom drede.
Crist for his muchele myhtþ. hus helþ þenne and rede.
þe wot alle dede.
þe wot alle dede.
þe wot alle dede.

ne maþ him nomon deme so wel. iwis. ne al so rþhte.
for non ne knoweþ so wel his þonk. bute vre drýhte.
vých mon wot him seoluþ best. his werkes and his wille.
þat lest wot he seþþ ofte mest. 7 he þat al wot is stille.
Nis no witnesse al so muchel so monnes owe heorte.
for so seþþ þat vnhol is. him seoluþ hwat him smorteþ.
Vých mon schal him seoluþ deme. to deþþ óþer to lýue.
þe witnesse of his owe werk. þer to him schal drýue.
7 al þat euler mon haþþ idon. seþþen heo com to monne.
Al so he hit iseyþe on boke iwrýten. hit schal him þinche þenne.
Ne schal nomon beon ðyemed. after his bigýnnýnge.
Ah dom schal ðolyen vých mon. after his endinge.
If þe ende is vuel. al hit is vuel. god þef vs god ende.
God þef vs vre ende god. hwider þat he vs lende.
þe mon þat neuer nule do god. ne neuer god lif lede.
þat deþ come to his dure. he maþ sore adrede.

huþch mon him seoluþ schal her. bi cleopien. and ek deme.
his owene werkes and his þouht. to witnesse hit schal teme.

90 ilóme] diac above o 92-96 these lines are out of order and the scribe has made a mistake as a result. Line 94 should follow line 92 with drede rhyming with ledeþ (more correct version: dradde and ladde). Instead the scribe has added þ to deme (93) to rhyme with ledeþ – which it follows. Line 96 should follow line 93 (rhyming deme and quemþe). Line 95 has been added at this point to try to rectify a spoiled rhyme scheme. This line is adapted from a line found later in the verse-sermon 105 heo] int. after were þyte]
heþþe has been subp. with þyte added to the right-hand margin, marked for trs.
pat he ne Muwe bidden ore. for pat itýt ilome.

vor þi is wis þat bit ore. and bet. bi vore þe dome.
hwenne dē þis at þe dure. wel late he bit ore.
wel late he lete þat vuel. þenne he ne maþy do na more.
Bilef sunne hwil þu myht. and do bi godes lore.
and do to gode hwat þu myht. if þu wilit habben ore.

For we hit ileueþ wel. and drýhten seolf hit seýde.
on hwiche týme so euer þe mon. of þincheþ his myþdene.
þe þe þer after þer later. Milce he schal þi mete.
Ah he þat nouht naueþ ibet. muchel he hauþe to bete.

Moný mon seþ þu rekþ of þýne. þat schal habben ende.
Ne biddeich no bet. bute ich beo. ilesed a domes dane.
Lutel wot he hwat is pynþe. 7 lutel he hit iknoweþ.
hwich hete is þar þe soule wuneþ. hw bitter wýnd þer bloweþ.

heded he iwunþ þer enne daþ. oþer vnnþe þe one týde.

Nolde he for al þe middelerd. an oþer þer abýde.
Sþiþe grýmlþch stench þer is. 7 wurþþ wýþ vten ende.
7 hwo þe enes cumþ þer. vt maþ þe neuer þenne wende.
Neuer ich in helle ne com. ne þer to cume ne recche.
þah ich al þes worldes weole. þer wende to vecche.
þat seýden þeo þat weren þer. heo hit wisten myþd iwisþe.
þer þurh seorewe of seoue þer. for soue nýhtes blýþse.
7 for þe blýþse þat ende hauþeþ. endeþes is þe pyne.
Beter is porie wateres drung. þane atter meýnd myþd wýþe.

Swýnes brede is swete. so is of þe wilde deore.

Al to deore he hit buþ. þat ÿeueþ þar vore his sweore.
ful wombe maþy lihtliche speken. of hunger. and of festen.
so maþy of þýne. þat not hwat hit is. þat euer mo schal lesten.
heded he ifonþed summe stunde. he wolde seggen al oþer.
7 lete for crist. beo wif 7 child. fader. suster. and broþer

Al he wolde oþer don. 7 oþerluker þenche

hwenne he bþouhte on helle fur. þat nóþþing ne maþy quenchþe.
Eure he wolde in bonen beon. 7 in godnesse wunþe.
wiþ þat he myþte helle fur. euer fleon and schonþe.
7 lete sker al þes worldes weole. 7 þes worldes blýþse.
wiþ þat he myþte to heouene cumen. 7 beo þer myþd iwisþe.

Ich wile eu seggen of þe dome. as ich eu er seýþe.
on þe daþ and on þe dome. vs helpe crýþt and rede.
þer we Muwe beon aferd. and sore vs of drede.
þer vých schal seon him bi fore. his word and ek his desþe.
Al schal beon þer þeþonne ikud. þat er men lowen and stelen

Al schal beon þer þeþonne vnrwrien. þat men her wrien 7 helen.
Vve schulleþ alre monne lýþ. iknowe al so vre owe.

125 ilome] diac. above o  134 ibet] diac. above e  163 þer] foll. by a space left of about three letters
þer schulle beon euenýnges. þe riche and ek þe lowe.
þe dom schal beon sone idon. ne lest he nowhiht longe.
Ne schal him nomon menen þer. of strengeþe. ne of wronge.

þeo schullen habbe harde dom. þat er weren harde.
þeo þat vuele heold wrecche men. and vuele lawe arerde.
Alle þeo þat beoþ icumen. of adam and of eve.
Alle heo schule þider cumen. and so we owen hit ileue.
þeo þat habbeþ wel idon. after heore Mihte.
To heoueriche heo schulle fare. for þm ÿd vre dryhte.
þeo þat habbeþ feondes werk idon. 7 þer in beoþ ifunde.
heo schulle fare for þf mýd him; in to helle grunde.
Þer ho schulle wun ÿen. o. buten ore and ende.
Ne brekeþ nought crist eft helle dure. to lessen heom of bende.
Nþs no seollich þeh heom beo wo. he mawe wunþe eþe
Nul neuer eft crist þolýe deþ. to lesen heom of deþe.
Enes drihte helle brek. his freond he vt brouhte.
him seolue he þolede deþ for vs. wel deore he vs abouhte.
Nolde hit nomon do for me. ne suster for broþer.
Nolde hit sone do for vader. ne nomon for óper.
Vre alre louerd for vs þrelles. ipþned wes on rode.
Vre bendes he vnbond. 7 bouhte vs mýd his blode.
And we þeyeþ vnneþe. a stucche of vre brede.
we ne þenchþe nouht þat he schal deme. þe quýke 7 ek þe deþe.
Muchel luue he vs cudde. wolde we hit vnderstonde.
þat vre elderne mýs duden. we habbeþ harde on honde
Deþ com i þís Middelerd. þurh þe deofles onde.
7 sunne. 7 sorewe. 7 muchel swýnk. a water. 7 a londe.
Vre forme faderes guilt. we abuggeþ alle.
Al his ofspring after him. in harme is ifalle.
Þurst and hunger. chele. and hete. ache and vnhelþe
þurh him com in þís mýddelerd. 7 oþe vnýselþe.
Nere nomon elles ded ne sek. ne non vnhele.
Ah mýhten libben euer mo. mýd blýsse and mýd wele.
Lutel hit þinchþe monýmon. ah muchel wes þe sunne.
for whon alle þolþe deþ. þat comen of heore kunne.
Vre sunne and vre sor. vs mýy sore of þunche.
In sunnen we libbeþ alle. 7 seorewe. and in swýnke.
hwenne god nom so muche wrecche. for one mýsdede.
We þat ofte mýs dopþ. we mown vs sore adrede.
Adam 7 his ofspring. for ore bare sunne.
weren feole hundred wynþer in pyne. 7 on vnwunne.
And þeo þat leþþe heore lif. mýd vniht 7 mýd wronge.
Bute hit godes mýlce beo. he beó þar wel longe.  
Godes wisdom is wel muchel. 7 al so is his myhte.  
Nis his mýlce nowiht lasse. ah al bý one wyhte.  
More he one may for þeue. þan al volk agulte kunne.  
þeyh seolfe deouel myhte habbe mýlce. If he hit bi gunne.  
De þat godes mýlce sekþ. iwis he hit may fýnde.  
Ah helle kýng. is ore les. wiþ þon þat he may býnde.  
þe þat dop his wille mest. he schal habbe wrst mede.  
His báþ schal beo wallýnde pich. his bed bernýnde glede.  
Also ich hit telle as wýse men vs seýden.  
And on heore boke. hit iwrýten is. þat me may hit reden.  
Ich hit segge for heom. þat er þis hit nusten  
And warný heom wiþ harme. if heo me wulleþ lusten.  
Vnderstondþeþ nv to me. edýe men and arme.  
Ich wille ou telle of helle pýne. and warný of harme.  
þar is hunger and þurst. vuele tweýe ivere.  
þeos pýne þolieþ þer. þaþ were mete nýþinges  
þar is wonýng and wop. after vlche strete.  
ho vareþ from hete to chele. from chele to þar hete  
Ḥwenne heo cumeþ in hete. þe chele heom þincheþ lýsse.  
þenne heo cumeþ eft to chele. of hete heo habbeþ mýsše.  
Eýþer heom dop wo ý nouh. nabboþ heo none lisse.  
heo nuten hweþer heom dop wurþe. myd neuer none iwisse.  
heo walkeþ euer and secheþ reste. ah heo hit ne muwe ime te  
for heo holde hwile heo myhten. heore sunnen ibete.  
Ḥeo schecheþ reste þer non nýs for þi ne muwen hi finde.  
Ah walkeþ þar boþe vp and dun. so water dop myd winde.  
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þis beþ þe þat weren her Mid hwom me heold feste.  
And þeo þat gode bi heýhte wel. and nolden hit ileste.  
And þeo þat god were by gunne and ful endy hit nolden.  
Nv were her. nv were þer. heo nuste hwat heo wolden.  
Þet ich pých. þat euer walleþ. þat heo schulle habbe þere.  
þeo þat ledeþ heore lýf vnwreste. and eke false were.  
þar is fur an hundred folde. hatture þan be vre.  
Ne may hit quenche no salt water. ne auene strem. ne sture.  
þat is þet fur þat euer barþe. ne may hit nomon quenche.  
þar inne beþ þeo. þat her wes leof. poure men to swenche.  
Þeo þat were swikelemen. and ful of vułe wrenche.  
And þeo þat ne myhte vułe do. 7 was hit leof to þenche.  
þeo þat luued reving. and stale. 7 hordom. 7 drunken.  
And on deoules werke. bluþeliche swunkene.  
þeo þat were so lese. þat me heom ne myhte ileuen.
Med ðorne domes men. and wrongwise reuen.  
þat wes leof ðoper mannes wif. 7 his owle leten  
And þat suñegþ ofte. on drunken. and on mete  
þeo þat wrecche men býnyþmeþ. his eýhte. 7 hit leýþ an horde.  
And lutel let on godes bode. and of godes worde.  
þeo þat almes nolde þyeþ þere he iseþ þe neode.  
Ne his poure kunçmen. at him ne mýhte nouht spede.  
Þat wolde here godes sonde. þar he sat. at his borde.  
7 was leof ðoper mannes þing. leuere þan beon schulde  
7 weren al to gredi. of seoluer. and of golde.  
7 luueden vntrewnesse. þat heo schulden beon holde.  
7 leten þat hi scolden do. and duden þat heo ne scolden.  
heo schulle þat hi scolden do. and duden þat heo ne scolden.  
heo schulle þat hi scolden do. and duden þat heo ne scolden.  
heo schulle þat hi scolden do. and duden þat heo ne scolden.  
yt heo beoþ a wrse stude. anýþe helle grunde.  
255 260 265 270 275 280 285 290
Ne schullen heo neuer cumen upp for marke. ne for punde. Ne maȝ helpe þer. nouȝer beode ne almesse.

for nŷs noȝer in helle. ore ne ſeuenesse.

Nu schilde him þŷc mon hwile he maȝ. wiþ þe ilke pŷne. And warñy vîc his freond. so ich habbe mŷñe.

þeo þat schilde heom ne kunne. ich heom wille têche.

Ich con beon eŷþer if ich schal. lycome and soule leche.

Ne maȝ helpe þer. nouȝer beode ne almesse.

Nu schilde him vŷch mon hwile he maȝ. wiþ þe ilke pŷne. And warñy vîc his freond. so ich habbe mŷñe.
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VÝve wilneþ after worldes aŷhte. þat longe ne maȝ ȝileste. And mest leggeþ vre svŷnþk. on þing vnstudeueste.

If þat we swunken fors gode. half. þat we dôþ for eŷhte. Nere we nouht so ofte bi cherd. ne so vuele by þouhte.

ýef we seruede gode. so we doþ for eŷhte.

And of alle vre sunnen. vs lete cûme to bote. VÝve wilneþ after worldes aŷhte. þat longe ne maȝ ȝileste. And mest leggeþ vre svŷnþk. on þing vnstudeueste.

If þat we swunken fors gode. half. þat we dôþ for eŷhte. Nere we nouht so ofte bi cherd. ne so vuele by þouhte.

ýef we seruede gode. so we doþ for eŷhte.

Ne mowe nought werŷen heom. wiþ chele ne wiþ hunger. Ne wiþ elde ne wiþ deþe. þe eldure ne þe ýonge.

Ah þer nŷs hunger ne burst. ne deþ. ne vnelheþ ne elde. Of þis world we þencheþ ofteþ and þer of al to selde. VÝve schulde vs bi þenche. wel ofte and wel ilome.

hwat we beoþ. to hwan we schulen. 7 of hwan we komen. hw lutle hwile we beoþ here. hw longe elles hware.

7 after gode wel wurche. þenne ne þurruue noht kare. If we were wïse men. þus we schulde þenche.

Bute we wurþe vs iwar. þes worlde vs wile for drench. Mest alle men he ÿeueþ drïnke. of one deofles [þenche] he schal him cunne schilde wel. ýef he him [wile bi þenche]

Mid almȳhtŷþes godes luue. vte we vs werie. wiþ þeos wrecche worldes luue. þe heo vs ne derŷe.
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Ah drŷhten crist vs þyeue strengþe. stonde þat we mote. And of alle vre sunnen. vs lete cûme to bote. VÝve wilneþ after worldes aŷhte. þat longe ne maȝ ȝileste. And mest leggeþ vre svŷnþk. on þing vnstudeueste.

If þat we swunken fors gode. half. þat we dôþ for eŷhte. Nere we nouht so ofte bi cherd. ne so vuele by þouhte.

ýef we seruede gode. so we doþ for eŷhte.

And of alle vre sunnen. vs lete cûme to bote. VÝve wilneþ after worldes aŷhte. þat longe ne maȝ ȝileste. And mest leggeþ vre svŷnþk. on þing vnstudeueste.

If þat we swunken fors gode. half. þat we dôþ for eŷhte. Nere we nouht so ofte bi cherd. ne so vuele by þouhte.

ýef we seruede gode. so we doþ for eŷhte.

Ne mowe nought werŷen heom. wiþ chele ne wiþ hunger. Ne wiþ elde ne wiþ deþe. þe eldure ne þe ýonge.

Ah þer nŷs hunger ne burst. ne deþ. ne vnelheþ ne elde. Of þis world we þencheþ ofteþ and þer of al to selde. VÝve schulde vs bi þenche. wel ofte and wel ilome.

hwat we beoþ. to hwan we schulen. 7 of hwan we komen. hw lutle hwile we beoþ here. hw longe elles hware.

7 after gode wel wurche. þenne ne þurruue noht kare. If we were wïse men. þus we schulde þenche.

Bute we wurþe vs iwar. þes worlde vs wile for drench. Mest alle men he ÿeueþ drïnke. of one deofles [þenche] he schal him cunne schilde wel. ýef he him [wile bi þenche]

Mid almȳhtŷþes godes luue. vte we vs werie. wiþ þeos wrecche worldes luue. þe heo vs ne derŷe.
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Ah strong hit is to stonde longe. hit is to falle. Ah drŷhten crist vs þyeue strengþe. stonde þat we mote. And of alle vre sunnen. vs lete cûme to bote. VÝve wilneþ after worldes aŷhte. þat longe ne maȝ ȝileste. And mest leggeþ vre svŷnþk. on þing vnstudeueste.

If þat we swunken fors gode. half. þat we dôþ for eŷhte. Nere we nouht so ofte bi cherd. ne so vuele by þouhte.

ýef we seruede gode. so we doþ for eŷhte.

And of alle vre sunnen. vs lete cûme to bote. VÝve wilneþ after worldes aŷhte. þat longe ne maȝ ȝileste. And mest leggeþ vre svŷnþk. on þing vnstudeueste.

If þat we swunken fors gode. half. þat we dôþ for eŷhte. Nere we nouht so ofte bi cherd. ne so vuele by þouhte.

ýef we seruede gode. so we doþ for eŷhte.

Ne mowe nought werŷen heom. wiþ chele ne wiþ hunger. Ne wiþ elde ne wiþ deþe. þe eldure ne þe ýonge.

Ah þer nŷs hunger ne burst. ne deþ. ne vnelheþ ne elde. Of þis world we þencheþ ofteþ and þer of al to selde. VÝve schulde vs bi þenche. wel ofte and wel ilome.

hwat we beoþ. to hwan we schulen. 7 of hwan we komen. hw lutle hwile we beoþ here. hw longe elles hware.

7 after gode wel wurche. þenne ne þurruue noht kare. If we were wïse men. þus we schulde þenche.

Bute we wurþe vs iwar. þes worlde vs wile for drench. Mest alle men he ÿeueþ drïnke. of one deofles [þenche] he schal him cunne schilde wel. ýef he him [wile bi þenche]

Mid almȳhtŷþes godes luue. vte we vs werie. wiþ þeos wrecche worldes luue. þe heo vs ne derŷe.

315

Ah hit hongeþ and hald. bi þisse twam worde. Alle godes lawe he fulleþ. þe newe. 7 ek. þe olde. þat haueþ þeos ilke two luuen. 7 wel heom wille atholde.

Ah soþ ich hit eu segge. ofte we agulteþ alle. for strong hit is to stonde longe. 7 lýht hit is to falle. Ne wiþ elde ne wiþ deþe. þe eldure ne þonge. Of þis world we þencheþ ofteþ and þer of al to selde. VÝve schulde vs bi þenche. wel ofte and wel ilome.

hwat we beoþ. to hwan we schulen. 7 of hwan we komen. hw lutle hwile we beoþ here. hw longe elles hware.

7 after gode wel wurche. þenne ne þurruue noht kare. If we were wïse men. þus we schulde þenche.

Bute we wurþe vs iwar. þes worlde vs wile for drench. Mest alle men he ÿeueþ drïnke. of one deofles [þenche] he schal him cunne schilde wel. ýef he him [wile bi þenche]

Mid almȳhtŷþes godes luue. vte we vs werie. wiþ þeos wrecche worldes luue. þe heo vs ne derŷe.
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Ne wiþ elde ne wiþ deþe. þe eldure ne þe ýonge.

Ah þer nŷs hunger ne burst. ne deþ. ne vnelheþ ne elde. Of þis world we þencheþ ofteþ and þer of al to selde. VÝve schulde vs bi þenche. wel ofte and wel ilome.

hwat we beoþ. to hwan we schulen. 7 of hwan we komen. hw lutle hwile we beoþ here. hw longe elles hware.

7 after gode wel wurche. þenne ne þurruue noht kare. If we were wïse men. þus we schulde þenche.

Bute we wurþe vs iwar. þes worlde vs wile for drench. Mest alle men he ÿeueþ drïnke. of one deofles [þenche] he schal him cunne schilde wel. ýef he him [wile bi þenche]

Mid almȳhtŷþes godes luue. vte we vs werie. wiþ þeos wrecche worldes luue. þe heo vs ne derŷe.
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Lete we þeō brode strete and þene wey grene.
þat lat þe nýeþe to helle of folke and mo ich wene.
Go we þene narewe wey þene wey so schene.
þer forþ fareþ lutel folk. and þat is wel ep sene.
þe brode strete is vre wil þat is vs lop to lete.
þe þat al feleweþ his wil heareþ þe brode strete.
Þe narewe wey is godes heste þat forþ fareþ wel fawe.
þat beþe þeo þe heom scheldeþ wel wiþ vých vnþewe.
þeþos goph vnþeþe aþeþyn þe cleþ. aþeþyn þe heyþe hulle.
þeþos leþeþ awei al heore wil. for godes hestes to fullen.
Go we alle þene wei. for he vs wile brýnge.
Mid þe fewe feþyremen byuoren heouene kinge.
þer is alre Mureþe mest. myd englene songe.
wel edþy wurþ þilke mon þat þer býþ vnþeruonige.
þe lest haueþ mureþeþ. he haueþ so muche. ne bit he namore.
hwo so þeþo blisse for þisse forþyet. hit maþ him rewe sore.
Ne maþ no þýne ne no wone beon in heouene riche.
þah þer þeon wonþynges feole and oþer vnþyliche.
Summe habþþeþ lasse Mureþeþ. 7 summe habþþeþ more.
vých after þat he dude her. 7 after þat heo swunken sore.
Ne wrþ þer bred ne wýn. ne noneþ kunnes este.
God one schal beon eche lif. 7 blisse eche reste.
Þer nýþ nouþer fou ne gregþ. ne konþyng. ne hermþyne.
Ne oter. ne acquerne. Beueþyr ne saþlyne.
Ne þer ne wurþ ful iwþs. worldes wele none.
Al þe Mureþeþ þat me vs bihat al hit is god one.
Nis þer no Mureþeþ so muchel. so is godes sýhte.
he is soþ sunne. and briþt. and daþ byte nýhte.
He is výche godes ful. nýþ him nowiht wiþ vte.
Nis heom noneþ godes wone þaþþ wuneþ hým abute.
þer is weole byte wone. and reste byte swýnke.
hwo maþ byþer cume and nule. hit schal hým sore of þinche.
þer is blyþse byte teone. and liþ wiþ vte deþe.
þeþo þat schulle wunþýþ þer. bliþe mwven heo beon eþe.
Þer is ýonghede buten ealþe. and hele buten vnþelþe.
þer nýþ seorewe ne no sor. neuer non vnþelþe.
Seoþþe me drÝþten iseo. so he is myþ iywise.
he one maþ beþon and schal. englene and monne blisse.
Þeo schulen of him more iseo. þat her him luuede more.
And more iseo and iwyten. his Milce and his ore.
On him heo schullen fÝnden. al þat mon maþ luste.
7 on lÝves bec iseo. al þat heo ner nusten.

335 narewe| written, by the main hand, into a space too small for it 330 þisse| are subp. after þ with isse int. 364 þat wuneþ hým abute| 7 rest byte swýnke canc. (crossed through); these words begin the following line (eyeskip). þat wuneþ hým abute is added to the bottom of fol., with þ int. after þa 376 beþ| c written over another letter
Crist seolf on schal beon. i nouh to alle derlinges  
He one is more and betere. þan alle wordliche þinges.  
Nouh hi habbéþ þat hýne habbéþ. þat alle þinges weldeþ.  
him to seonne murie hit is. so fáýr he is to biholde.  
God is so swete 7 so muchel. in his godnesse.  
Al þat wes 7 is. is wel wurse and lasse.  
Ne mây nomon hit segge. ne wýten mýd iwisse.  
hu muchele Mureþþe habbéþ heo. þat beþþ in heuene blisse.  
To þare blisse bringe vs god. þat lesteþ buten ende.  
hwenne he vre saule vn bind. of lichomliche bend.  
Crist vs lete such lif lede. 7 habbe her such ende.  
þat we mote to him cume. hwenne we heonne wendeþ Amen.  
Bidde nu we leoue freond. ýonge and ek olde.  
Þat he þat þis wrýt wrot. his saule beo þer atholde. Amen.
Cambridge,
Fitzwilliam Museum
MS McClean 123
folios 115r-120r
Transcription of Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123, folios 115–120r

**MS Pointing:** The text of M is without regular pointing at mid-line or end-line. Any occurrence of punctuation, therefore, is shown below as well as in the text: A punctus is present after the following words: **sonne, mone, sterre** and **fur:** line 70; **child** and **suster:** line 142;

Regular capitalization occurs at the beginning of each line and will not be commented on in the notes to the text unless it differs from the norm; that is, where an enlarged or coloured letter is present, or a capital is missing when expected.

Abbreviations, which are very rare in M, have been silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below: þ has been expanded to ἃ on only six occasions, at lines: 167, 298\(^{(2)}\), 312, 316 and 317. The more regular form in M, however, is to have ἃ written out in full: ii, 7, 10, 20, 21 etc. Other than the above, there are only two further occurrences of abbreviations in the text: pate expanded to pater: line 184; ponige expanded to poninge: line 217;

**Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:**

The dialectal features of Fitzwilliam MS McClean 123 are somewhat mixed and a localization has, as a result, been difficult. M. L. Samuels believes the language to be of Essex with a western dialect layer,\(^{853}\) whereas Jordan places it in Kent.\(^{854}\) However, the current belief by Laing (LAEME) that places it in Central Gloucestershire has now generally been accepted,

---


\(^{854}\) Richard Jordan, p.10.
with the belief that ‘the apparently recalitrant elements perhaps having been current also in the SW Midlands at that time.’

The graph <d> is very rare in M. It is written three time in final position (§ 4.6): plled, peneð and habbeð and once in initial position, where it is written as <d> (§ 3:3): darf. The letter <d> does not occur in the list of Runic/Old English letters at the beginning of the text of M, where <þ> does (§ 4.6). M writes <th> (§ 5) in sathanas, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 Remark) and once in repeth. The graph <d> is written for <þ> on two occasions (§ 7.6): lodliche, a reading shared with both J and M, and darf.

The runic letter <þ> (wynn) is retained throughout M with only three examples of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.7): yswinch, we and wode. M writes the Tironian nota <h> (§ 13.1) throughout this text with only one occurrence of and being written (§ 13.6).

Insular ʒ is retained in M alongside Caroline ɔ (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): grameþ, grunde, glede etc. and before the OE back-vowels a, o, u (§ 42.2): (holi) gostes, god, gulte etc. and by levelling in ginnige (§ 42.3).

The movement to <w> is not present in M, which retains ʒ for the fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43.11) in moge, oge(n), drage etc. M preserves ʒ for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): jung, zet, uorzet etc. Initial ʒ is retained before i in gef (§ 45.4). M demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in forpreie with ʒ retained in ezen, peze, ne-seze and yseze (the writing of ʒ in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement ig > i (§ 48) in holi, ani, mani etc is further demonstrated in M. Palatal ʒ /j/ is lost before d (§ 49) in sede but is more regularly vocalized to

---

atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325, compiled by Margaret Laing
/i/ in *seid* (§ 49.7). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cʒ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in *bugge, sigge* and *legge* (§ 50). The OE group nʒ/ng/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.22 and § 51.25): *longe/lange, pronge, kinge, reuing* etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/, written <nc> before <þ> in *sincþ* (§ 51.25); M regularly omits <n> before <gg> (§ 51.23): *poniegge, ernigge, endigge* etc.

In initial position /k/ is nearly always written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in *king(e), kinges, kenne(s)* but it is <c> in *cune*. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written <c> in *cunin, care, cump* etc. but <k> is found in *kan* and *kunne*. Before <n> (§ 18) it is always <k> in *knope, (i)knope* and *biknope* and before other consonants (§ 19) it is always <c> in *(i)clupede, clife, and criste.*

M writes <qu> (§ 20) for OE cw in *quepe, ýqueme, quike* etc. M writes <k> in medial position for OE velar c throughout the text: (§ 21 and § 21.7): *speke, prke, sclaie* etc. with only the one occurrence of <c> (§ 22 and § 22.7) found in *brecþ*. However, <c> is retained in final position (§ 23 and § 23.7): *ac, þanc, loc* etc. in all but two examples; with <k> written in *uolk* and *pork* (§ 24 and § 24.2).

M always writes <ch> for /tʃ/ (§ 27, § 28.7, § 29.7 and § 30.7): *child(e), chise, teche, muchel, ich, euerich* etc and in *pinche* (§ 32 and § 32.25) and *penche* (§ 32 and § 32.27) etc. with <c>, probable /k/, written in *pinch* and *of-pinch* (§ 32.1 and § 32.26) and *bipanc* (§ 32.1 and § 32.28). M also writes <c>, probable /k/, in *recþ* where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at § 33 and § 33.7).
M nearly always writes <sc> (§. 35.7) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: scilde, scal, scerreue etc., with only one exception, <sch> (§. 37.4) is written in schat. In final position /ʃ/ is <sh> in fish (§. 39). OE [ts] is always written <s> in mise (§. 41) where all other MSS have <ç>.

M sometimes writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position and sometimes voiced [v] as <u>/<v> (§ 58 and § 58.25): fram, fele, for etc. but vele, uor, uorzet etc. In final position <f> is retained in of, lif, self (§ 58.26) etc. and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: ofte, eft, after (§ 58.26) etc. However, voicing is normal (§ 58 and § 58.27) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in him-seolue, euel, aliue etc. with only one instance of <f> being retained in bifore etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before d in hadde (§ 58.28).

In M OE a in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): habbe, faren, nauep etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.7) in man, panne, phanne etc., with rare occurrences of <o> found in bonke and bonc. Before a lengthening group, OE a is almost always <o> (§ 61 an § 61.7): longe, strong(e), honde etc. but <a> in lange. M always writes <a> for OE ae (§ 63 and § 63.7): habbe, pateres, phat etc. OE e is nearly always <e> in M (§ 64 and § 64.10): bere, ende/end. felde, imengd etc. with <i> in sigge (usually a Kentish or East Anglian form) in siggen, <a> in bipancp and <a> also in anglene (this is probably under the influence of OF angele, angle). OE o is always written <o> in < (§ 65.1 and § 65.9): bifore, bode, nolde etc. M: OE i is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.17) in bidde, child(e), finde etc. with occasional <u> in pule and pullep (see § 66.4 for the influence of w) and <e> in ofspreng and nele, nelle and neste (§ 66.17, § 66.18 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to ę). For OE y, M writes a mixture of <u>, <e> and <i> (§ 67ff and § 67.17): dude, gulte, muchel etc., misdede, (vn)net, penchep etc. and pinche, aurist, king(e)s etc. OE y is <i> in litel/litle and lite, <u> in fur(e) and cupe and and <e> in (vn)hed. M demonstrates transition to <o> for
OE ū on most occasions (§ 68 and § 68.7): *come, ponie, ponieges* etc. with occasional <u> still written in *cumþ, grunde* and *biginne*.

M writes <o> for OE ā, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.10): *lore, one, non* etc. with rare <a> in *namore* and *hatter*. In M OE æȝ is always written as <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): *dede, rede a-adrede* etc (for OE þær see § 77ff). OE æȝ is written <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) *mest, unhelpe, lest* etc. with rare <a> (§ 79.5) written in *ilad, ladde* and *ani* (for æc, elc and ylc see § 81ff). OE ē is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.7): *he, dep, ýqueme* etc (the writing of *doð* is by analogy, see § 82.1). OE ē is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.9): *mi, priste, hpile/huile/hpil* etc. OE ṏ is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.1): *to, dome, boc* etc. (the writing of *can* is by analogy, see § 84.1). OE ū is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): *nu, ure/vre, ðu* etc.

In M OE ea (§ 86 and § 87ff) before r, without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 88.1 and § 88.20): *arþ, darþ, suarte* and *narepe*; before rd (§ 88.21) it is <a> in *harde* and *hardne* but <e> in *middel/erd*; before rm (§ 88.22) <a> is written in *parni* with <e> found in *ernigge*. The i-umlaut of ea before r-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.10) in *smerte* and *ernigges*. OE ea before l (Anglian a), without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.10): *al* and *alle, falle, palles* etc.; before ld <e> is mostly written (§ 91.9) *pelden, eld, felde etc.* (for the writing of <ʒe> at the beginning of *gelde*, see § 91.2), with <ie> written in *bihielde* and <a> in *halt*. For the i-umlaut of ea before l combinations (Angl. mutation of a) M has <e> in *elder* and *elde* (§ 92ff and § 92.10). OE ea before ḥ combinations is <e> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.9) in *hege*. The i-umlaut of ea before ḥ-combinations is always <i> in *migte(n)* and *nihte* (§ 94.1 and § 94.2).

For OE eo before r-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.9) M writes <o> in *porkes, porc/pork, <u>* in *purkes* (possible influence of w, see § 97 and § 97.9) and *sturre* with <e> in *herte*. OE eo before l-combinations is <e> (§ 98ff and § 98.4) in *selue/selfe*. OE eo before ht is always <i> (§ 99.1
and § 99.8) in risipisesse, rjste and brjste and <e> for the \( \mathbf{i} \)-umlaut (§ 100ff and § 100.10) in ouersich and purysicb. OE – WS eom is am (chiefly Angl. eam § 101). OE eo (\( a \)-umlaut of e) is always <e> in M (§ 102ff and § 103.1): vele/uele/fele. brekeð and unureme. OE eo (\( u \)-umlaut of e) is regularly <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.7) in heuen, heueneriche, heuenliche etc. with <o> written in porld/world, porldes and pode with <u> written under the influence of w in suster. The velar umlaut io of i (§ 105ff) in M (§ 105.10) is <e> in seue, binepe, selure, henne; <a> in hare; <w> in suppe, icluped and hure and <i> in nifer, (bi)nime, sippe and quike.

For OE ëa (§ 106ff and § 106.9) M contains a mixture of variants with <e> in eke/ec, vnnepe, depe and brede/bred with <ie> (see § 106.2) in lien and <e> (see § 106.2) in ȝep-lete and ȝedi and <ia> (see § 106.2) in diape. The \( i \)-umlaut of ëa (§ 107.1 and § 107.2) is nearly always <e> in yleue, teme. ilesed etc., with <u> written in ihear. OE ẽo (§ 108ff and § 108.9) is mostly <e> with some <eo> writings present, a form associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1): ben, leue, frend etc. with beo, beop, iseo etc. and <i> in sike. The \( i \)-umlaut of ẽo (§ 109 ff) is mainly <e> (§ 109.10) in frend, fend, dere etc. with <w>, <>, possibly from WS y (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /\( ð \)/ from ëo, written once in ãusternesse.

In M OE ea after sc (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.8) is nearly always <a> in scal, scamie, schate etc. with <e> written once in scfte. For the \( i \)-umlaut of ea after c (§ 113.8) M writes <e> in chele. OE ëa after g (§ 114) is <e> in ȝer. For OE iε after g (§ 116.7) M always writes <e> (Anglian § 115.1): uorzet, geue, bigete etc. Similarly, for OE iε after g M writes <e> in ȝet (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE iε after sc (§ 118.7) M writes <i> in (i)scilde and scildeb. OE eo after g (§ 119.1 and §120.7) is <u> in ȝung and ȝunge. OE eo after sc (§ 121.1) is written as either <u> in scullen or <o> in scolde(n) and sop.
OE æ + ʒ /j/ is nearly always <ai>/<aŷ> in M (§ 122.1 and § 122.8) in mai/maŷ, dai/daie and saɪp LWS sæde / Anglian sæde (§ 123 and § 123.7) is <ei> in seide with <e> once in sede. OE æi(A angl. Kent, <e> /ei/) + ʒ /j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.7) is <ei> in mei, <e> yseže and iseže. OE æ2 + ʒ /j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.7) is <ai> in aïp. OE e + ʒ /j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.8) is <e> in eie, pei/peŷ with <e> in peze(s). OE ā + ʒ /j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.7) is <ei> in forpreie and <e> in leŷe. OE ā + ʒ /j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.7) is <e> in ezen(e) and raketeʒe. OE ā + h (g) (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <aʒ> in faʒ and aʒte. OE æ2 + h (§ 132.1 and § 133.7) is <e> before ʒ in eʒte and teʒte. OE ø + h (§ 134.1 and § 134.8) in M is <o> before ʒ in unboʒt, biboʒt, broʒte etc. OE ø + ɣ (§ 136.1 and § 136.8) is <o> in draʒe and laʒe. OE ø + ɣ (§ 137.1 and § 137.8) is <o> (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in moʒe and oʒe(n). OE ø + w (§ 138.1 and § 138.8) is mostly <o> before w (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in mopen, iknope, blopeþ etc, with the <ou> combination present in soule but <au> written on three occasions in saule. OE œ + w (§ 139.1 and § 139.8) is <e> before w in repe and sepe. OE œa + w (§ 140.1 and § 140.8) is <e> in uepe.
The verso of f. 114v is dedicated to the reproduction and explanation of the Old English letters and the Tironian nota for 'et', probably as an aid to the reader, suggesting that these letters and symbols were not in common usage at the time of the text being copied into this manuscript. The scribe includes examples of usage alongside an explanation of the letters and symbols.

In spelling the letter, w is used rather than ŵ; williame] the letter w is used rather than ŵ; the remainder of the folio is left blank [i] ich am elder ðane ich pas of pintre 7 of lore
Ich eldi more ðan ich dude mi pit aȝte beo ðe more
To longe ich habbe child ibeo of pordes 7 of dede
Ƿeȝ ich beo of pintres eld to ðunge ich am of rede
Vnet lif ich habbe ilad 7 ȝet me ðincȝ ich lede
Ƿhane ich me ðiþenche þel sore ich me a drede
Mest phat ðat ich habbe ido is idelnes 7 chilse
To late ich habbe me ðiþoȝt bute me crist do milse
Veþ idele pordes ich habbe ispeke sîþpe ich speke cuþe
7 feþe ȝunge dede ðido PageRoute me repeth ſuþe
Al to muchel ich habbe a gult of prke 7 of porde
Al to muchel ich habbe ispend to litel ileid on horde
Ich ðizte bet habbe ðido Þef ich hadde þe selþe
Nu ich polde 7 ich ne mai for elde ne for unhelþe
Elde me is istolen up on erþan ich hit piste
Þat ich ne mai me iseo before ur smiche ne for miste
Arȝ þe beoþ to donne god of euel al to þriste
More eie stondeþ man of man þan him do of criste
[Þ]e þel ne ðeþ þe þifere he mai sore hit scal him reþe
Ƿhane þi sculþ mope 7 ripe her þat hi er seþe
Dophe al to gode þat þe muþe þe þifere þe þeþ aliue
Ne þust þe þoman to muchel to childe ne to þiue
Man þat hine selue uorȝeþ uor þiue oper uor childe
Ne scal come in euele stede bute god him beo milde
Ne beo þe þeuere þane þi self þi mei ne þi moþe
Sot is þat is oþre mannes frend betere þane his oþe
Ne trust pif to hire pere ne pere to his püe
Biþore him do pel euerich man þe phile he is alie
Uor he 'is' pis þat hine bǐþaþ þe phile þat he mot libbe
So sone þleð hine uorzete þe uremde 7 þe sibbe

f. 115v

[D]e pel ne dep þe phil he mai ne scal he phane 'he' polde.
Mannies mannes sor yswinch habbeþ ofte unholde
Ne scolde noman don auirst ne sclakie pel to done
Vor mani man bihotþeþ pel 7 hit forzet pel sone
Ac þilke man þat ple beo siker to habbe godes blisse
Dis riche men þeneþ beo siker þurþ palles 7 þurþ diche
Ac þe dep his eþte in sikere stede he hit sent to heueneriche
Vor þar ne darf he ben afered of fure ne of þeue
Par ne mai hit him binime þe loþe ne þe leue
Par ne darf he habbe care of þunge ne of þelde
Þider pe sendeþ 7 us self bereþ to litel 7 to selde
Þider ze scolde alle don polde ze me þleue
Par ne miþte me hit us binime king ne no scerreue
Þider pe scolde bere 7 draþe ofte 7 pel þylome
Par ne miþte me hit us binime mid none pronge dome
Al þat faireste þat man haueþ to gode he hit scolde sende
Par he hit miþte me hit finde. eft 7 habbe euere bute ende
Þe man þe his eþte pel pile pite þe phile he mai pelde
þeþe he uor godes loue þanne beþ þi pel ihelde
Þe man þat ani god dop her uor habbe godes ore
Par he hit scal finde eft and hundredfelde more
Þe man þat dep her mest to gode 7 alþre lest to loþe
Aiþer to litel 7 to muchel hit scal him þinne boþe
Phane me scal ure purkes þeþe to uore þe heuenkinge
7 þeþe us ure suinches lien after ure ernigge
Ne scal non euel beo unboþt ne no gode unþulde
Euel pe dop al to muchel god lasse þane pe scolde
Ac euerich man mid þan þe he haueþ mai bugge godes riche
Þe þeþe more haueþ 7 þe þat lasse boþe ilîche
Aþe þel þon mid his þenie alþe þe ρeber mid his þunde
Þis is þat alþre beste þare þat euere þaþ funde

f. 116r

7 þe þat ne mai namore do mid is gode þonke
Also pel so he þat haueþ of godes fele monke
Vor ofte god kan more þone him þat zeþþ lasse
3ef his porkes 7 his þezes is milse 7 riȝtþpinse
Litel loc is gode leþ þat cumþ of gode pille

29 is] int. after he 31 be] ρ om.; a two-line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin  he] int. after phane
7 ʒeþ lete muchel ʒeue of him þat his herte is ille
Heuene 7 erpe he ouersicþ his ʒene þeþ pel briȝte
Sonne. 7 mone. sterre. 7 fur. is þestre to ʒenes his liȝte
He þot 7 palt þat doþ 7 queþþe alle quiue piȝte
Nis no louerd suich is crist no king suich is ure driȝte
Heuene 7 erpe god almiȝtiti halt al in his honde
He deþ al þat his pille is a þatere 7 a londe
He scuppeþ þe fish in þe seo þe foȝel þi þe lefte
He þot ale kennes þing he scop alle scetfe
7 he is ord bute ord 7 end bute ende
He is one in eueriche stede pende þhider þu þende
He is boue 7 he is bineþ bioure 7 bihinde
þe man þat godespille deþ oueral he hine mai finde
Eche rune god ihurst god pot ache dede
He þurȝsicþ aches mannes þonc þat scal us to rede
þe þat breþþþ ðodes ilþest 7 gultþ suþ ylome
Þhat sculle þe sigge oþer do atte heþe dome
þe þat her habbeþ a gult 7 euel liþ her ladde
Huat sculle þe come to dome þar angles þeþ adradde
Þhat sculle þe bere us bioure mid þam sculle þe þyqueme
þe þat non god ne habbeþ ýdo þe heuenliche deme
þar sculle beo deueles suþ fele 7 þulleþ us forpreie
Ne habbeþ hi noþing foȝteþ þer þat hy þyseþe
Al þat þe misdude þer hi hit us þilleþ cuþ þare
þute þe hit habbe þer ibet þe þhile þat þe þere þere
Al hi habbeþ in hure þrute þat þe þisdeþ þere
þeþ þe hi neste ne ne iseþe hi þere ure ýfere
Iesu crist seinte marie sone us alle helpe 7 rede
7 euermore ýscilde us uram euele ýuerrede
[þ]hat sculle horlinges do þe suike 7 þe þorsuorene
Aþi so fele beþþ icliped so uþpe beþþ ýcorene
A þi þat scolde hi biȝþþe þat scolde hi ýborene
Þat sculle beþþ to deþe ýdo 7 euermore uorlorene
100
Ac euerich man him selue scal bicþþþie 7 eke deme
Al his þorkes þ þþþ þar to þe þal teme
Euerich man him selue scal deme to diaþþ oþer to liue
þe þitnesse of his þorkes þo þe þan him scal drieþ
Nis no þitnesse al so muchel so is þe mannes herte
105
þe man þat saþ þat þe is lame himself þe þot þe smerte
Ne mai no man þene þane man also riȝþte
Not non his þorkes so þel so þot ure drieþþe
Euerich man himself þot þest his þorkes 7 his þille
þe þat þot þest þaþ ofte mest 7 þþ þat al þot is stille

83 ihest] isest, scribal error? 97 [þat] P om.; a two-line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin
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Ac crist ne demeþ nanne man after his ginnigge
Ac al scal beo his lif iteld suich is his endigge
ʒef his ende is euel al hit is euel 7 god ʒef god beoþ his ende
Iesu crist leue þat ure ende beo god 7 pitie þat he us lende
Ac þe þat nele neuere no god do ne god lif her lede
Ere deþ 7 dome come to his dore sore he mai adrede
Þat he ne muþe þanne bidde ure uor þat itit ilome
Vor þi he is pis þat ore bit 7 bet biuore dome
Vor þanne deþ 7 dome comeþ to his dore to late he biddeþ ore
To late he leteþ euele þorkes þat ne maþ hy do namore
Þhane sene þet þe 7 þu naþt hi 7 þu ne miþt do namore
To longe he abit þat suo abit to bidde cristes ore
Ac naþeþles þe hit ilueþ uor driþten self hit sede
Of phiche time þat man of þincþ his misdede
Oþer raþer oþer later milþe he scal ýmete
Ac pho so nopen her naueþ ibet muchel he haueþ to bete

f. 117r
Ac mani man saþ þho recþþ of pine þat scal habbé ende
Ne recche ich beo ich a domesdai ilesed ut of bendé
O. lite pot he þat is pine 7 lite pine he knoþþ
Huiche pine þe soule þoleþ hu biter pind þar bloþþ
Vor hadde þe þar ibeo tuo bare tide
Vor al þat golþ of midelerd þe þridde he nolde abide
Þat siggeþ þe þat pere þar 7 pite hit mid ipisse
Þo þrþ þe sorþþe of seueþþer uor ore niþþte blisse
Vor ore blisse þat ende haueþ endeþes pine
Betere is þori þateres drinch þane atler imegd mid pine
Suines brede þeþ þel suete 7 so hi þeþ of þe dere
Al to dere he þi þeiþ þat ʒefþ þar uore his suere
Vul þombe mai liþþliche speke of hunger 7 of uaste
Suo mai of pine þat not þat hie is þat euere scal ilaste
Haddé þe þfondeþ one stunde he þolde sigge anoþþer
þeþ leté him þere þif 7 child. suster. vader 7 broþþer
Eueremore her in po 7 in pine ponie
Þþ þan þe he miþþte helle pine ule 7 ýssonie
Vor of þar þine þat þar beþþ nelle ich 30 nóþþing leþþe
Nis hit bute game 7 gleþ þer þat þat flesh mai dreþþe
[0ſ] þe dome þe þleþþ speke of þhan ich 30 er seide
At þan daie þan dome crist us helþe 7 rede
þþ þe þar þeo aþered 7 harde us adrede
þþ þar þueriche man þyþþþ biuore his þorkes 7 his dedþ
Al scal beo þar vnþþþed her þat þe þele
Al scal beo þar unþþþþe her þat man luþþþ 7 steþþ
þþ þe scullþ aþes manþþe lif iknoþþe ase uþe oþþe
Þar scull euenigges beo þe heþe 7 þe loþe
Ne scal him næþt scamie þar ne darf he him adrede
He þe ofþuþte her his gult 7 bette his misdede
Him ne scameþ ne him ne grameþ þat scal beo iboreþe
Ac þe ofþre habbeþ scame 7 grame 7 ofþre fele soreþe

Al þat euere ýsprungen is of adam 7 of eue
To þe dome hi sculle come forsoþ þe hit ýleue
Hi sculle habbe hardne dom þat here pere Harde
Þe euere helde poure men 7 euere laþe arerde
euerich after þan þe he haueþ ido he scal þar beo ýdemed
þelle bliþe mai he beo þat gode her haueþ inuemed
þo þat gode iserued habbeþ after hare miþte
Hi sculle to heueneriche fare uorþ miþe 7 þe oþre habbeþ orc habbeþ ido 7 þar inne beþ funde
Hi sculle selle adun mid him into hele grunde
7 þare hi sculle ponie euermore bute ende
Ne brecþ neuerþ eft þis ltds helle for ham to bringe ham ut of bende
Enes uorþ loued helle brac his fred he ut broþte
Himself þe þoldeþ deþ for us þel dere he us boþte
Nolde hit fader do for þe sune ne suster uor þe broþer
Ne hit moyþ uor þe mei ne noman uor oþer
Vnþeþ þe þeþ for his loue a stecche of uorþ brede
Lite þe þencþ þat he scal deme þe quikeþ þe dede
Vre loued uor his þreþles ipined pas on þe rode
Vre þendas he unþond þe þoþte us mid his blode
Muchel þe dude for uorþ loue þef þe hit þolde understande
Ac þat þe uor eldringes misdede þe hit habbeþ pel harde on honde
7 lite þencþ þani þan hu lite pas þe sunne
þurþ þan þiþ come of adammes kunne
Deþ com in þis midelerd þurþ þes deuþles onde
Sunne 7 soþeþ 7 in suinch a patere 7 a londe
þurþ 7 huþer. chele. 7 hete. eche. 7 unþeleþ
þurþ þeþ com in þis midelerd þan þanie oþre unselþe
Elles nere noman died ne sike ne unsele
Ac miþte ÿþbe euermore in blisse 7 in hele
Adam 7 his ofþpreþ uor ore bare sunne
þere uele hundred þrinte in helle píþe 7 in unþenne
7 suþþþe god dude so muchel \þreþe/ uor ore misdede
þe þat so ýlome 7 ofte agulteþ her pel sore þe maþe a drede
7 þe þat leþþe hare lif mid þerre 7 mid ýþronge
Bute hit godes milse do hi sculle beo þar þel longe
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Godes psdom is pel muchel 7 so beþ his mîste
Nis his mîste no lasse þane pas þo bi þan ilke piȝte
More he one mai uorȝeue þane al uolk gulte kunne
De selue deuel mîste habbe milse zef he hit hadde bigunne
Pe man þe godes milse isceþ ipis he hit scal finde
Ac helle king is oreles piȝ þan þat he mai binde
De þat deþ his pille best þrst he haueþ mede
His baþ scal beo þallinde pich his bed berninde glede
þrst he deþ his godewines þane his fulle uende
Iesu crist us iscilde alle fram suicche euele frende
[N]eure in helle ich ne com ne neuere come ne recche
Paȝ ich al þes porldes pele þar inne pende uccche
Ac þeþ ich plle 30 telle ase pise men me seide
7 on boc hit is irpite 7 ze hit habbeþ ihurd rede
7 ich hit plle telle us þat hit er neste
7 þarni us piȝ unureme zef ze me plleþ ileste
Vnderstondeþ nu to me ȝedi men 7 areþe
7 ich ou plle telle of helle pîne 7 þarni us piȝ harme
In helle is hunger 7 þurst pel uele tuo iuere
Þos pine sculle polie þar þat pere niþinges here
Pe hadde þis porldes eȝte 7 faste gunne hielde
7 hi nolde helpe þar of þe hungri ne þe chielde
Þar is poninge 7 þop in euerliche strete
Hi uareþ uram hete to þe chele uram chele to þe hete
Þhane hi beþ in hete þe chele ham þincheþ blisse
Þhane hi beþ in þe chele of þar hete hi habbeþ misse
Neteþ hi neure þhaþer ham dop þrs to neuere non þyþise
Aþer ham dop þo inoþ ne habbeþ hi none lisse

f. 118v
Hi palkeþ euere 7 secheþ reste ac hi ne muȝe þymete
Vor þan þe hi nolde þe huile hi mîste hure sennes bete
Hi secheþ reste þar non nis 7 hi ne muȝe non þar finde
Ac palkeþ peri vp 7 dun suo þater dop mid þe pinde
Pos beþ þe þat pere her of þonke unstedeuaste
De þe bihete iuere crist 7 nolde him þylate
De þat god þrc bigunne 7 fulendi hit nolde
7 þere her 7 phile þar 7 neste huat hi polde
Þar is þat pichi þat euere palþ þat sculle þe beo inne
De þat ladde hure lif mid perre 7 mid þyþinne
Þar is þat fur þat is hundredfelde hatter þane vre
Mot hit noþer aquence auene streem ne sture
Þat is þat fur þat euere barnþ þat noþing ne mot aquence
Þe sculle beo inne þe þere leþ poure men to suenche
7 þe þe louede reuing 7 stale 7 unmetliche drunke 
7 ec in þes deueles pork suo bleþeliche sponke 
þe þe pere so lese þat me ne miȝte ham þyleue 
Medȝerne domesman 7 prongepise reue 
þe þe pas oþre mannnes piues lef his oȝen zeþ lete 
7 seneȝede bleþeliche on drunke 7 on ete 
þe þat þoueman binome 7 leide in hare horde 
7 litel lete of godes hest 7 of godes porde 
þe þe pere þeseres of þisse porld est 
7 dude al þat þe loþe gost hem þiȝte to 7 teȝte 
þe þe þas oþre mannnes god leuere þan him scolde 
7 þere al to gredi of selure 7 of golde 
7 vnriȝpisnesse dude þar si scolde beo holde 
Lete þat þi scolde do 7 dude þat þi ne scolde 
þe þat in alle pise þe þeuele her iquemde 
Do beþ in helle mid him uor done 7 uor demde 
Bute þe þat of[f]þuȝte sore hure misdede 
7 hure gultes gunne bete 7 betere lif lede 
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Pe pilniep after porldes peł þat lange nele ileste
7 legęelp muchel ure suinch in þing unstedeuaste
Suuńke pe uor godes loue alse pe dop uor este
Nere pe noþing suo ofte forgelt ne biþeȝte
7 þef pe serude gode alsuo pe dop ermigges 285
Pe miȝte in heuene habbe al so muche ase erles oþer kinges

f. 119v
Vor almiȝti godes loue pute pe us þerie
Piþ þe precche porldes pele þat hie us ne derie
Mid almesse mid ibede þerie us piþ senne
Mid þe pepne þat god almiȝti biþeȝte alle mankenne 290
Pe scoldes us biþenche ofte 7 pel ýlome
Þhat pe þep to þan pe sculc 7 phar of pe come
þef pere piþeman þus pe scoldes þehenche
7 bute pe þrþe us iar þe woorld us ple adrenchene
Mest manne hie þeueþ drinch of one duole scenche 295
He scal him cunne scilde pe þef hie him nele screnchene
Lete pe þe brode strete 7 þane pei bene
þat let þat niȝeþe del to helle of mankenne 7 mor þast ich þene
Nime pe þane nareþe þap 7 þane þey grene 300
Par forþ farþ þe þat silleþe þam her þiþ euerich unþeþe
Pos goþ æzenes þe þeþe clif æzenes þe þeþe hulle
Hi leþþ al hure oþe þil goþes hesne to felle
Þurþut þe godleþe wode in to þe bare felde
Pe nareþe þap is godes heste ac þare uorþ uareþ þel ueþe 305
7 þis beþ þe þat scildeþ ham her þiþ euerich unþeþe
Pos goþ æzenes þe þeþe clif æzenes þe þeþe hulle
Hi leþþ al hure oþe þil goþes hesne to felle
Go pe þele in þilke þap 7 he us þule bringe
Mid þe þeþe uaire men biuore þe heuenkinge 310
Þar is blissee mest mid anglene songe
Pe þat is uele hundred pintre þar ne þincþ hit hi nȝt longe
Mai non hunger ne no pane beþ in godeþriche
Þar beþ þonegles feþe 7 ech oþer unliche
Sum þar haueþ lasse murþeþe þ sum þar haueþ more 315
Euere after þat þat he dude her of þat þe he bisuanc sore
7 þe þat haueþ lest he haueþ suo muche þat þe ne bit nammore
Hpo se let þe blisse uor þeþ hit scal him repe þore

f. 120r
Ne scal þar beþ noþer bred ne þin ne oþre kenne este
God scal beþ eueriches lif blisse 7 eke reste 320
Ne scal þar beþ noþer foþ ne grei cunig ne ermine
Okerne ne martenin beuer ne sabeline
Ne scal þar beo noþer schat ne scrud ne porlde pele none
Al þe blisse þat me us bihot al hit scal beo god one
God is suo mer 7 suo muchel in his godnesse
Þat he mai 7 pule beo anglene blisse
Ac þeȝ ne beoþ ure ezene alle ilderne briȝte
Ne in þis þorlde nere naȝt alle of one miȝte
Þar ne sculle naȝt habbe god al mid one piȝte
Hi sculle more of him pite þe louede hine more
7 biknoþe 7 ýseo his milse 7 his ore
To þare blisse us bringe god þat ricscleþ aȝ bute ende
Þhane he ure saule unbint of ilderne bende
Crist us leue lede suich lif 7 habbe suichne end
Þat þe mote to him come phane þe henne þende Amen
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